Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/revisionofenglis0000jbli

# THE REVISION

OF THE

## ENGLISH VERSION

OF THE

# NEW TESTAMENT.

BY

J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D.,

CANON OF ST. PAUL'S,

AND HULSEAN PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, CAMBRIDGE;

RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D.,

ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN;

C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D.,

BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

## WITH AN INTRODUCTION

BY

PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

*NEW YORK:*

HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS,

FRANKLIN SQUARE.

1873.

HIEBERT LIBRARY
Pacific College - M. B. Seminary
Fresno, Calif. 93702

776

FF
L626S

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1872, by
HARPER & BROTHERS,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

# INTRODUCTION

ON THE

# REVISION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

BY

PHILIP SCHAFF.

HIEBERT LIBRARY
Pacific College - M. B. Seminary
Fresno, Calif. 93702

# CONTENTS.


Trench, Ellicott, and Lightfoot on Revision ..... Page vii
The British Revision Committee ..... ix
Rules of the British Committee ..... x
American Co-operation ..... xv
List of American Revisers ..... xvi
First Meeting of the American Revisers ..... xvii
Constitution ..... xviii
Character of the English Version—the Work proposed ..... xx
Improvements:
- The Text ..... xxiv
- Errors ..... xxx
- Inaccuracies ..... xxxiv
- Inconsistencies ..... xxxix
- Archaisms ..... xliii
- Proper Names ..... xliv
- Accessories ..... xlv
- Arrangement ..... xlvi

Conclusion ..... xlviii

# INTRODUCTION.

## BY THE EDITOR.

### TRENCH, ELLICOTT, AND LIGHTFOOT ON REVISION.

As the question of revising for public use the English Version of the Holy Scriptures has at last assumed a definite practical shape in Great Britain, and must before long claim the serious attention of all churches which use the same version, it occurred to me that this important subject could not be better introduced to American scholars than by a republication of the recent treatises of Archbishop Trench, Bishop Ellicott, and Professor Lightfoot, on the principles and mode of revision. Some friends, whose judgment I value, agreed with me in this opinion. Accordingly, I asked the consent of the esteemed authors, which was promptly and cheerfully given.

The eminent divines, whose works are united in this volume, are above all others qualified to speak with authority on the subject of revision. They bring to its discussion ample learning in classical, Biblical, and English literature, a high order of exegetical skill and tact, sound judgment, long experience, conservative tact, profound reverence for the Word of God, and a warm affection for the Authorized Version. They are also well acquainted with the labors of German divines, who have made large and valuable contributions to every department of Biblical science. They adorn high places of honor and influence in the Church of England, which gave us the present version, and has a hereditary right and duty to take the lead in its

improvement. They are active members of the British Committee on Revision, and fairly represent its ruling spirit and tendency.

Going over the same ground, these authors can hardly avoid repetition. They independently agree on the fundamental principles and chief improvements. At the same time, they represent the progressive stages through which the revision movement has passed within the last twelve years.

Archbishop Trench wrote his work in 1859, before the Revision Committee was organized, with the intention not so much either to advocate or to oppose revision, as to prepare the way for it by a calm, cautious, and judicious examination of the strength and weakness, the merits and faults of the Authorized Version, and arrived at the conclusion that revision will come, and ought to come, though it has come sooner than he at that time anticipated or desired.*

Eleven years later (1870), soon after the Convocation of Canterbury had taken the first step toward an organized effort of revision, Bishop Ellicott followed with his treatise, presenting the principles and aims of the present revision movement, and his own experiences when acting as one of five Anglican clergymen in a previous attempt to revise some portions of the English New Testament. He reviews the recent labors in the department of textual criticism, refutes the popular objections, and gives judicious recommendations, and a few samples of revision, selecting the Sermon on the Mount from Matthew, and four of the most difficult chapters of the Epistle to the Romans.

Professor Lightfoot, of Cambridge, whose name recalls another of England's greatest and most useful Biblical

* The first edition was reprinted in New York, 1858, but was superseded by the greatly improved edition of 1859.

scholars, prepared his work in 1871, after the Revision Companies had begun their sessions in the Deanery of Westminster. He therefore represents the actual work of revision, and discusses it with such learning and ability, and in so catholic a spirit, as to inspire confidence in its ultimate success.

It seems proper that I should add to these prefatory remarks some account of the revision movement, and its present prospects in the United States.

### *The British Revision Committee.*

The present organized effort to revise the Authorized English Version of the Holy Scriptures originated, after long previous discussions, in the Convocation of Canterbury. This body, at its session May 6, 1870, took the following action, proposed by a committee which consisted of eight bishops, the late Dean Alford, Dean Stanley, and several other dignitaries:

1. That it is desirable that a revision of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken.

2. That the revision be so conducted as to comprise both marginal renderings and such emendations as it may be found necessary to insert in the text of the Authorized Version.

3. That in the above resolutions we do not contemplate any new translation of the Bible, or any alteration of the language, except where, in the judgment of the most competent scholars, such change is necessary.

4. That in such necessary changes, the style of the language employed in the existing version be closely followed.

5. That it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong.

The report was accepted unanimously by the Upper House and by a great majority of the Lower House. A committee was also appointed, consisting of eight bishops and eight presbyters, to take the necessary steps for carrying out the resolutions.

The Convocation of York, owing mainly to the influence of the excellent Archbishop Thomson, did not fall in with the movement, and is therefore not represented in the Committee on Revision. But a favorable change is gradually taking place, and some of the most influential members of the Convocation, as Dean Howson, of Chester, are hearty supporters of revision.

### *Rules of the British Committee.*

The Committee of bishops and presbyters appointed by the Convocation of Canterbury, at its first meeting, the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Samuel Wilberforce) presiding, adopted the following resolutions and rules as the fundamental principle on which the revision is to be conducted:

'RESOLVED,—'I. That the committee, appointed by the Convocation of Canterbury at its last session, separate itself into two companies, the one for the revision of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament, the other for the revision of the Authorized Version of the New Testament.

'II. That the company for the revision of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament consist of the Bishops of St. Davids, Llandaff, Ely, and Bath and Wells, and of the following members from the Lower House—Archdeacon Rose, Canon Selwyn, Dr. Jebb, and Dr. Kay.

'III. That the company for the revision of the Authorized Version of the New Testament consist of the Bishops of Winchester, Gloucester and Bristol, and Salisbury, and of the following members from the Lower House, the Prolocutor, the Deans of Canterbury and Westminster, and Canon Blakesley.

'IV. That the first portion of the work to be undertaken by the Old Testament Company be the revision of the Authorized Version of the Pentateuch.

'V. That the first portion of the work to be undertaken by the New Testament Company be the revision of the Auth. Vers. of the Synoptical Gospels.

'VI. That the following scholars and divines be invited to join the Old Testament Company:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ALEXANDER, Dr. W. L. | GINSBURG, Dr. | PEROWNE, Professor J. H. |
| CHENERY, Professor | GOTCH, Dr. | PLUMPTRE, Professor |
| COOK, Canon | HARRISON, Archdeacon | PUSEY, Canon [declined] |
| DAVIDSON, Professor A. B. | LEATHES, Professor | WRIGHT, Dr. (British Museum) |
| DAVIES, Dr. B. | M'GILL, Professor [deceas'd] | WRIGHT, W. A. (Cambridge).* |
| FAIRBAIRN, Professor | PAYNE SMITH, Canon [now Dean of Canterbury] | |
| FIELD, Rev. F. | | |

'VII. That the following scholars and divines be invited to join the New Testament Company:

* Dr. Douglas and Dr. Weir, of Glasgow (Presbyterians), and J. D. Geden (Wesleyan), were subsequently added to the Old Testament Company.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Angus, Dr. | Lee, Archdeacon | Smith, Rev. G. Vance |
| Brown, Dr. David | Lightfoot, Dr. | Scott, Dr. (Balliol Coll.) |
| Dublin, Archbishop of | Milligan, Professor | Scrivener, Rev. F. H. |
| Eadie, Dr. | Moulton, Professor | St. Andrew's, Bishop of |
| Hort, Rev. F. J. A. | Newman, Dr. J. H. [declined] | Tregelles, Dr. |
| Humphry, Rev. W. G. | Newth, Professor | Vaughan, Dr. |
| Kennedy, Canon | Roberts, Dr. A. | Westcott, Canon. |

'VIII. That the general principles to be followed by both companies be as follows:

'1. To introduce as few alterations as possible in the text of the Authorized Version consistently with faithfulness.

'2. To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the Authorized and earlier English versions.

'3. Each company to go twice over the portion to be revised, once provisionally, the second time finally, and on principles of voting as hereinafter is provided.

'4. That the text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating; and that when the text so adopted differs from that from which the Authorized Version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin.

'5. To make or retain no change in the text on the second final revision by each company except *two thirds* of those present approve of the same, but on the first revision to decide by simple majorities.

'6. In every case of proposed alteration that may have given rise to discussion, to defer the voting thereupon till the next meeting whensoever the same shall be required by one third of those present at the meeting, such intended vote to be announced in the notice for the next meeting.

'7. To revise the headings of chapters, pages, paragraphs, italics, and punctuation.

'8. To refer, on the part of each company, when considered desirable, to divines, scholars, and literary men, whether at home or abroad, for their opinions.

'IX. That the work of each company be communicated to the other as it is completed, in order that there may be as little deviation from uniformity in language as possible.

'X. That the special or by-rules for each company be as follows:

'1. To make all corrections in writing previous to the meeting.

'2. To place all the corrections due to textual considerations on the left-hand margin, and all other corrections on the right-hand margin.

'3. To transmit to the chairman, in case of being unable to attend, the corrections proposed in the portion agreed upon for consideration.

'May 25th, 1870. S. Winton. *Chairman.*'*

From this list of names, it will be seen that the Committee, in enlarging its membership, has shown good judgment and eminent impartiality and catholicity. Under the fifth resolution of the Convocation of Canterbury, it was em-

* Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Winchester.

powered 'to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, *to whatever nation or religious body they may belong*.' The Committee accordingly solicited the co-operation of the most distinguished Biblical scholars, not only from all schools and parties of the Church of England, but also from Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, Wesleyans, and other Christian denominations. With two or three exceptions, the invitation was accepted by all. Dean Alford, one of the most active promoters of the revision movement, died prematurely (January, 1871), but his works remain to aid the cause. Dr. Tregelles is prevented by feeble health from taking an active part; but he is present in spirit by his critical edition of the Greek Testament, to which he has devoted the best years of his life. The two companies hold sessions four days every month in the venerable Deanery of Westminster. One company occupies the historic Jerusalem Chamber, where the Westminster Assembly met, and where the Convocation of Canterbury holds its sessions.

The Committee includes a large portion of the ripest and soundest Biblical scholarship of Great Britain. I do not hesitate to say that in ability, learning, tact, and experience it is superior to any previous combination for a similar purpose, not excepting the forty-seven revisers of King James, most of whom are now forgotten. Trench, Ellicott, Lightfoot, Stanley, Wordsworth, and the late Dean Alford stand first among the modern exegetes of the Church of England, and Alexander, Angus, Brown, Eadie, Fairbairn, Milligan, hold a similar rank among the other denominations. There are no textual critics now living superior to Tregelles, Scrivener, Westcott, and Hort (except Tischendorf in Germany, who stands first in reputation and in the extent of his labors and resources).

It was my privilege, during a visit to England in 1871,

to attend, by special invitation, the sessions of the two companies in the Deanery of Westminster, and to observe their mode of operation. I was very favorably impressed with the scholarly ability, the conscientious accuracy and thoroughness, the reverent spirit and truly Christian harmony which characterize the labors of the revisers. Every question of textual criticism and exegesis receives careful attention, and every word and its best rendering are minutely discussed. The revisers come thoroughly prepared to each session, the several parts of the task, as readings, marginal references, being assigned to sub-committees. In this way they finish, on an average, about forty verses a day.

Such an amount of work bestowed on the Book of books can not be in vain. It may take seven or ten years till the revision is finished, but it will be all the better for it. There is no need of haste in so important and responsible an undertaking. The revisers have the power in their hands; they can supply their vacancies, add to their number, and prolong their labors as the case may require. Their services are gratuitous. The two Universities, in consideration of the copyright of the revised edition, have undertaken to pay the cost of printing and other expenses. But, until the whole is completed, no parts will be published except for the strictly private use of the revisers. This is no doubt a wise course, and will prevent much premature and unnecessary criticism.

I add a full list of the members of the British Committee as it was furnished to me in England, excluding those who declined or died, and including those who are members *ex officio*, or who have been added since the organization.

(1.) OLD TESTAMENT REVISION COMPANY.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of BATH and WELLS, Palace, Wells, Somerset.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of ELY, Palace, Ely.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of LLANDAFF, Bishop's Court, Llandaff.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of ST. DAVID'S (*Chairman*), Abergwili Palace, Carmarthen.
The Very Rev. the Dean of CANTERBURY, Deanery, Canterbury.
The Ven. Archdeacon HARRISON, Canterbury.
The Ven. Archdeacon ROSE, Houghton Conquest, Ampthill.
The Rev. Canon SELWYN, Trumpington Road, Cambridge.
The Rev. Dr. KAY, Great Leighs, Chelmsford.

The Rev. Dr. ALEXANDER, Pinkieburn, Musselburgh, Edinburgh.
R. L. BENSLY, Esq., University Library, Cambridge.
Professor CHENERY, Reform Club, S.W.
The Rev. Professor DAVIDSON, 10 Rillbank Terrace, Edinburgh.
The Rev. Dr. DAVIES, Baptist College, Regent's Park, N.W.
The Rev. Dr. DOUGLAS, 10 Fitzroy Place, Glasgow.
The Rev. Principal FAIRBAIRN, 13 Elmbank Crescent, Glasgow.
The Rev. F. FIELD, 2 Carlton Terrace, Heigham, Norwich.
The Rev. J. D. GEDEN, Wesleyan College, Didsbury, Manchester.
The Rev. Dr. GINSBURG, Holm Lea, Binfield, Bracknell, Berks.
The Rev. Dr. GOTCH, Baptist College, Bristol.
The Rev. Professor LEATHES, King's College, London, 47 Priory Road.
The Rev. Canon PEROWNE, Trinity College, Cambridge.
The Rev. Professor PLUMPTRE, Pluckley, Ashford.
The Rev. Professor WEIR, University, Glasgow.

W. ALDIS WRIGHT, Esq. (*Secretary*), Trinity College, Cambridge.

### (2.) NEW TESTAMENT REVISION COMPANY.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of WINCHESTER, Winchester House, S.W.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of GLOUCESTER and BRISTOL (*Chairman*), Palace, Gloucester.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of SALISBURY, Palace, Salisbury.
The Very Rev. the Dean of WESTMINSTER, Deanery, Westminster, S.W.
The Very Rev. Dr. SCOTT, Dean of Rochester, Rochester.
The Ven. the Prolocutor, The Prebendal, Aylesbury.
The Rev. Canon BLAKESLEY, Vicarage, Ware.

The Most Rev. the Archbishop of DUBLIN, Palace, Dublin.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of ST ANDREW'S, The Feu House, Perth.
The Rev. Dr. Angus, Baptist College, Regent's Park, N.W.
The Rev. Dr. DAVID BROWN, Free Church College, Aberdeen.
The Rev. Professor EADIE, 6 Thornville Terrace, Glasgow.
The Rev. F. J. A. HORT, 6 St. Peter's Terrace, Cambridge.
The Rev. W. G. HUMPHRY, Vicarage, St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, W.C.
The Rev. Canon KENNEDY, The Elms, Cambridge.
The Ven. Archdeacon LEE, Dublin.
The Rev. Canon LIGHTFOOT, Trinity College, Cambridge.
The Rev. Professor MILLIGAN, University, Aberdeen.

The Rev. Professor Moulton, Wesleyan College, Richmond, Surrey.
The Rev. Professor Newth, 25 Clifton Road, N.W.
The Rev. Professor Roberts, St. Andrew's.
The Rev. Dr. G. Vance Smith, York.
The Rev. Dr. Scrivener, Gerrans, Grampound.
Dr. Tregelles, 6 Portland Square, Plymouth.
The Rev. Dr. Vaughan, Master of the Temple, The Temple, London.
The Rev. Canon Westcott, Precincts, Peterborough.

The Rev. J. Troutbeck (*Secretary*), 4 Dean's Yard, Westminster.

### *American Co-operation.*

The British Committee is fully competent, without foreign aid, to do justice to the work committed to its care. Yet, in view of its practical aim to furnish a revision not for scholars, but for the churches, it is of great importance to secure, at the outset, the sympathy and co-operation of Biblical scholars in the United States, where the Authorized Version is as widely used and as highly respected as in Great Britain. Rival revisions would only add new fuel to sectarian divisions already too numerous among Protestants. Let us hold fast by all means to the strongest bond of interdenominational and international union which we have in a common Bible. The new revision, when completed, should appear with the imprimatur of the united Biblical scholarship of English-speaking Christendom.

In August, 1870, Dr. Joseph Angus, President of Regent's Park College, London, and one of the British revisers, arrived in New York, with a letter from Bishop Ellicott, chairman of the New Testament Company, authorizing him to open negotiations for the formation of an American Committee of Revision. At his request, I prepared a draft of rules for co-operation, and a list of names of Biblical scholars who would probably best represent the different denominations and literary institutions in this movement. The suggestions were submitted to the British Committee and substantially approved. Then followed

an interesting official correspondence, conducted, on behalf of the British Committee, by the Bishop of Winchester, the Dean of Westminster, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, and Dr. Angus. I was empowered by the British Committee to select and invite scholars from non-Episcopal Churches; the nomination of members from the American Episcopal Church was, for obvious reasons, placed in the hands of some of its Bishops; but, as they declined to take action, I was requested to fill out the list. It is not necessary, in this place, to enter into details. I will only state the result of the negotiations.

## *List of American Revisers.*

### THE OLD TESTAMENT COMPANY.

| | |
|---|---|
| Prof. THOMAS J. CONANT, D.D. | Brooklyn, N. Y. |
| " GEORGE E. DAY, D.D. | New Haven, Conn. |
| " JOHN DE WITT, D.D. | New Brunswick, N. J. |
| " WILLIAM HENRY GREEN, D.D. | Princeton, N. J. |
| " GEORGE EMLEN HARE, D.D. | Philadelphia, Pa. |
| " CHARLES P. KRAUTH, D.D. | Philadelphia, Pa. |
| " JOSEPH PACKARD, D.D. | Fairfax, Va. |
| " CALVIN E. STOWE, D.D. | Cambridge, Mass. |
| " JAMES STRONG, D.D. | Madison, N. J. |
| " C. V. A. VAN DYCK, M.D.* | Beyrut, Syria. |
| " TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D. | Schenectady, N. Y. |

### THE NEW TESTAMENT COMPANY.

| | |
|---|---|
| Right Rev. ALFRED LEE, D.D. | Wilmington, Delaware. |
| Prof. EZRA ABBOT, D.D., LL.D. | Cambridge, Mass. |
| Rev. G. R. CROOKS, D.D. | New York. |
| Prof. H. B. HACKETT, D.D., LL.D. | Rochester, N. Y. |
| " JAMES HADLEY, LL.D. | New Haven, Conn. |
| " CHARLES HODGE, D.D., LL.D. | Princeton, N. J. |
| " A. C. KENDRICK, D.D. | Rochester, N. Y. |
| " MATTHEW B. RIDDLE, D.D. | Hartford, Conn. |
| " CHARLES SHORT, LL.D. | New York. |
| " HENRY B. SMITH, D.D., LL.D. | New York. |
| " J. HENRY THAYER, D.D. | Andover, Mass. |
| " W. F. WARREN, D.D. | Boston, Mass. |

* Dr. Van Dyck, the distinguished translator of the Arabic Bible, can not be expected to attend the meetings, but may be occasionally consulted on questions involving a thorough knowledge of Semitic languages.

Rev. EDWARD A. WASHBURN, D.D. .....New York.
" THEO. D. WOOLSEY, D.D., LL.D.....New Haven, Conn.
Prof. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D. .....New York.

In the delicate task of selection, reference was had, first of all, to ability, experience, and reputation in Biblical learning and criticism; next, to denominational connection and standing, so as to have a fair representation of the leading Churches and theological institutions; and last, to local convenience, in order to secure regular attendance. Some distinguished scholars were necessarily omitted, but may be added hereafter by the committee itself.

So far as I know, the selection has given general satisfaction. A few gentlemen (not included in the above list) declined the invitation for personal reasons, but not from any hostility to the pending revision. One of these, a learned Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, wrote to me: 'Let me assure you, it is from no feeling that a revision is not needed, nor yet from any unwillingness to invoke aid in making it from others than members of the Church of England, that I have been led to this view of my duty.' Another wrote: 'Respecting the success of the enterprise I have little doubt. The result of the best scholarship of the Church in England and America will command assent, and the opposition will speedily subside.'

### *First Meeting of the American Revisers.*

On the 7th of December, 1871, a number of American revisers convened in New York for the purpose of effecting a temporary organization and adopting a Constitution. The meeting was very pleasant and harmonious. The following extract from the Minutes contains the items of public interest:

'At a meeting of gentlemen invited by Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., to meet this day at his study, No. 40 Bible House, New York, for the purpose of forming an organization to co-operate with the British Committee in the re-

vision of the Authorized English Version of the Scriptures, the following persons were present, viz. :

'Prof. Philip Schaff, D.D., New York; Prof. Henry B. Smith, D.D., New York; Prof. Wm. Henry Green, D.D., Princeton, N. J.; Prof. George Emlen Hare, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.; Prof. Charles P. Krauth, D.D., Philadelphia; Rev. Thomas J. Conant, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Prof. George E. Day, D.D., New Haven, Conn.; Ezra Abbot, LL.D., Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. Edward A. Washburn, D.D., New York.

'Dr. Howson, Dean of Chester, was also present by special invitation, and took part in the deliberations.

'Ex-President Woolsey, Prof. Hackett, Prof. Strong, Prof. Stowe, and others, were prevented from attending, but expressed by letter their hearty interest in the proposed work, and their readiness to co-operate.

'The meeting was organized by the appointment of Prof. Henry B. Smith as Chairman, and Prof. George E. Day as Secretary. * * * * * *

## *Constitution.*

'I. The American Committee, invited by the British Committee engaged in the revision of the Authorized English Version of the Holy Scriptures to co-operate with them, shall be composed of Biblical scholars and divines in the United States.

'II. This Committee shall have the power to elect its officers, to add to its number, and to fill its own vacancies.

'III. The officers shall consist of a President, a Corresponding Secretary, and a Treasurer. The President shall conduct the official correspondence with the British revisers. The Secretary shall conduct the home correspondence.

'IV. New members of the Committee, and corresponding members, must be nominated at a previous meeting, and elected unanimously by ballot.

'V. The American Committee shall co-operate with the British Companies on the basis of the principles and rules of revision adopted by the British Committee.

'VI. The American Committee shall consist of two companies, the one for the revision of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament, the other for the revision of the Authorized Version of the New Testament.

'VII. Each Company shall elect its own Chairman and Recording Secretary.

'VIII. The British Companies will submit to the American Companies, from time to time, such portions of their work as have passed the first revision, and the American Companies will transmit their criticisms and suggestions to the British Companies before the second revision.

'IX. A joint meeting of the American and British Companies shall be held, if possible, in London, before final action.

'X. The American Committee to pay their own expenses.

'A communication from Bishop Ellicott, D.D., to Dr. Schaff, dated October 23, 1871, was read, containing the following resolution of the British Committee:

'"*Resolution*—That the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol be requested to communicate with Dr. Schaff to the effect that the work of the New Testament revisers is at present only tentative and provisional, and that it may be considerably altered at the second revision; but that, upon the assurance of Dr. Schaff that the work, so far as it is at present advanced, will be considered as *strictly confidential*, the company will send a sufficient number of copies for Dr. Schaff and his brother revisers, for their own private use, the copies to be in no way made public beyond themselves.

'"For this purpose that Dr. Schaff be requested to send the names and addresses of the scholars associated with him in this matter so soon as the company is completely formed."' * * * * *

On the evening of the same day the movement was publicly inaugurated by a meeting in Calvary Church, Fourth Avenue, New York, at which Dr. Washburn, Dean Howson, D.D., and the writer made addresses on the subject of Bible Revision before a very large and intelligent audience, including many clergymen from different denominations. Full reports of the meeting were published in the *Christian Intelligencer*, the *Protestant Churchman*, and other papers.

The organization of the American Committee was duly reported. Certain difficulties which stood in the way of co-operation were removed by farther correspondence and personal conference of the writer with the British revisers on a recent visit to England. The British Committee, at its meeting July 17, 1872, took the following action:

'Dr. Schaff having communicated to the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol the following as the names of the American revisers, . . . . it was resolved that so many copies of the revised version of the first three Gospels be intrusted to Dr. Schaff for the use of the above named, with the request that they be regarded as private and confidential, and with the intimation that the work itself is provisional and tentative, and likely to undergo considerable modification.'

The copies promised in the above resolution were duly received. The Old Testament Company took similar action, and intrusted me with eleven proof copies of the revised version of the books of Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus for the use of the eleven members of the American

Company of Old Testament revisers. Other portions of the revised version will be forwarded as soon as they are finished.

The American companies will hold their first meeting for active work October 4, 1872. The result of their deliberations will in due time be forwarded to the British Committee for consideration before the second revision.

When the whole work shall be completed, it will go to the English-speaking churches for their adoption or rejection. By its own merits it will stand or fall. We firmly believe that it will gradually take the place of the Authorized Version.

*Character of the English Version. The Work proposed.*

In presenting briefly my own views on the subject of revision, I have no authority to speak in behalf of the American revisers, who have not yet fairly begun their work; but I apprehend no material difficulty with the British Committee. I have reason to believe that there is a general disposition among us to retain the idiom, grammar, and vocabulary of the Authorized Version so far as is consistent with faithfulness to the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, and with justice to the present stage of the English language.

The popular English Bible is the greatest blessing which the Reformation of the sixteenth century bestowed upon the Anglo-Saxon race. It is, upon the whole, the best translation ever made, not excepting even Jerome's Vulgate and Luther's Version. It is not the production of a single mind, but of a large number of wise and good men, representing three generations in the most eventful and productive period of modern church history. It is 'the pure well of English undefiled.' It has formed the style and taste of the English classics. It has a hold upon the pop-

ular heart which it can never lose. Its vocabulary and phrases, its happy blending of Saxon force and Latin dignity, its uniform chasteness, earnestness, and solemnity, its thoroughly idiomatic tone, its rhythmic flow, its more than poetic beauty and harmony, have secured the admiration of scholars and the affection of whole churches and nations in which it is used. Even in the Romish communion, a distinguished English apostate from Protestantism could not forget its marvellous beauty and heavenly music.*

* The remarkable judgment of the late Dr. F. William Faber (often falsely attributed to Dr. John Henry Newman) is well worth quoting in full: 'Who will say that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is not one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country? It lives on the ear like a music that can never be forgotten, like the sound of church bells, which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities often seem to be almost things rather than mere words. It is part of the national mind, and the anchor of national seriousness. Nay, it is worshipped with a positive idolatry, in extenuation of whose grotesque fanaticism its intrinsic beauty pleads availingly with the man of letters and the scholar. The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the griefs and trials of a man is hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best moments, and all that there has been about him of soft, and gentle, and pure, and penitent, and good, speaks to him for ever out of his English Bible. It is his sacred thing, which doubt has never dimmed, and controversy never soiled. It has been to him all along as the silent, but oh! how intelligible voice of his guardian angel, and in the length and breadth of the land there is not a Protestant, with one spark of religiousness about him, whose spiritual biography is not in his Saxon Bible. And all this is an unhallowed power!'—From Faber's Essay on *The Interest and Characteristics of the Lives of the Saints*, p. 116, prefixed to a *Life of St. Francis of Assisi* (1853), which forms vol. xxv. of the Oratory series of the *Lives of Modern Saints*. I took the quotation from an anonymous reviewer of Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, in the *Dublin Review* for June, 1853, p. 466. The Roman Catholic reviewer admits (p. 465 sq.) that the 'Douay version, composed as it was under heavy difficulties and the greatest disadvantages, is, upon the whole, surprisingly accurate and exact [?], though confessedly far from scholar-like as a literary performance, and as deficient in pure English idiom as the Protestant version is excellent in that particular;' but then he goes on to charge the latter with doctrinal unfairness, instancing the well-known passages 1 Cor. xi. 27, where ἢ (*πίνῃ τὸ ποτήριον*)—often used by Romanists as an argument for the communion *sub una specie*—is rendered *and;* Matt. xix. 11, *οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι*, 'all men *can not* receive the word;' Gal. i. 18, *ἱστορῆσαι Πέτρον*, 'to *see* Peter.'

The power and influence of this version can not be estimated. Being from the very start a truly national work for the British Isles, it has gradually assumed, with the English language itself, an almost cosmopolitan character and importance, and is now used more than any translation in all parts of the globe. The British and Foreign Bible Society, or the American Bible Society, probably send forth more copies of the English Scriptures than are printed in all other languages combined. Eternity alone can reveal how many millions have been made wise unto salvation through the instrumentality of this version.

To substitute a new popular *version* for such a work would be almost a sacrilege, certainly an ungrateful task and inevitable failure.

But this is not at all the question. The present movement contemplates no new version, but simply a scholarly and conscientious *revision*, in the spirit, and, as far as possible, in the very language, of the old. The object is to make a good translation still better, more accurate and self-consistent, and to bring it up to the present standard of Biblical scholarship.

The abstract *right* of revision can not be disputed. It is the duty of the Church, especially the Protestant, to give the Bible to the people in the best possible form, and to adapt existing translations, from time to time, to the progress in Scripture learning and the inevitable changes of a living language. Without this right and duty, King James's Version of 1611 would not exist at all, for it is itself the result of several revisions, going back—through the Bishops' Bible (1568), the Geneva Bible (1557, completed 1560), Cranmer's Bible (1539), Matthew's (or Rogers's) Bible (1537), Coverdale's Bible (1535 and 1537)—to the New Testament (with parts of the Old Testament) of Tyndale

(1525–1535),* who is the real author, as well as martyr, of the English version,† and, in the former respect, the English Luther.‡

The *need* and *desirableness* of a new revision are now almost generally admitted, at least by those who are best acquainted with the Bible in its original languages. The most ardent admirers of King James's Version do not claim for it perfection and infallibility. It has a very considerable number of errors, defects, and obscurities. It was the best translation which could be made in the beginning of the seventeenth century, but it can be greatly improved with the enlarged facilities of the present age.

The only debatable question, then, is as to the proper *time* and best *mode* of undertaking this important and desirable work. A few years ago many of the most judicious friends of revision would have said that the pear is not ripe yet, although fast ripening; but the recent movement in Great Britain settles the question. It combines all the needful scholarship, ability, authority, and co-operation. It presents the most favorable juncture which can be desired, and it must be turned to the best account. The greatest difficulty was in our sectarian divisions: it has been removed by the Spirit of God, who alone can so move the hearts of men as to bring Churchmen and Dissenters, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, Methodists, Baptists, and others, together in brotherly harmony and co-operation. To miss the glorious opportunity now is indefinitely to postpone the great work, or to risk the multipli-

* For details, see the excellent *History of the English Bible*, by Professor Westcott (one of the British Committee of Revision), London, 1868.

† Wicliffe's translation was not made from the original Greek and Hebrew, but from the Latin Vulgate, and was little used, if used at all, by Tyndale.

‡ Westcott, l. c., p. 66, pays him the following just tribute: 'Not one selfish thought mixed with his magnificent devotion. No treacherous intrigues ever shook his loyalty to his king; no intensity of distress ever obscured his faith in Christ.'

cation of sectarian versions—as there are already a Baptist and a Unitarian New Testament. Let us by all means have an œcumenical revision now when we can have it, which shall be a new and stronger bond of union among the many branches of Anglo-Saxon Christendom, and make the good old Bible clearer and dearer to the people.

### *Improvements.*

The improvements which can be made, without in the least impairing the idiom and beauty, or disturbing the sacred associations, of the Authorized Version, may be considered under the following heads, as needing revision: the Text; Errors; Inaccuracies; Inconsistencies; Archaisms; Proper Names; Accessories; Arrangement.

### 1. *The Text.*

To restore, from the best critical resources now made accessible, an older and purer text in the place of the comparatively late and corrupt *textus receptus*. In other words, to substitute, in the New Testament, an ante-Nicene for a mediæval text.

The Hebrew text, having been settled long ago by the Masorets, presents very little difficulty. It is stated that there are only 1314 various readings of importance in the Old Testament, and that only 147 of them affect the sense. With critical conjectures (such as proposed by Hitzig, Merx, etc.) a popular version has nothing to do. When the Authorized Version follows the Septuagint and the Vulgate against the Hebrew (as in the important passage Job xix. 26), the Hebrew text must of course have the preference.

The case is very different in the New Testament. The Authorized Version, like all other Protestant versions, is made from the 'received text,' so called, which dates from the first printed edition of the Greek Testament by Erasmus (1516), especially his fourth edition (1527, which contains some emendations in the Apocalypse, derived from the Complutensian Polyglot), was several times re-edited, with a few improvements, by Stephens, of Paris, and then by Beza, of Geneva, and boldly proclaimed the '*textus ab omnibus receptus*' by the enterprising publishers, Elzevir, of Leyden (in their second edition, 1633), and which ruled, almost undisputed, as a part of Protestant orthodoxy (as the Latin Vulgate as a part of Romish orthodoxy), until, after Bentley and Bengel had shaken confidence in it, it was set aside by Lachmann

(1831) and his followers, to make room for an older and better text since brought to light.*

The 'received text' was hastily derived, in the infant period of the printed Bible, from a few and faulty cursive MSS., when the best uncial MSS. and the oldest versions (except a corrupt text of the Vulgate) were not yet known, before the patristic quotations were examined, and before even the first principles of textual criticism were understood.†

Since that time an immense material for textual criticism has been gathered, compared, weighed, and sifted by the indefatigable labors of Mill, Bengel, Wetstein, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and others. We have now as complete an apparatus as is necessary to settle the text in all its essential features, and there is no prospect that any new discoveries (even as important as that of the Codex Sinaiticus in 1859) will materially alter the result, unless some future Tischendorf should be so fortunate as to find the apostolic autographs; but this, in view of the perishable nature of papyrus, on which they were written, is next to impossible. Over 1500 MSS. of the Greek Testament have been more or less compared.‡ and from 100,000 to 120,000 various readings have been accumulated from all textual sources to the present day. Fortunately, these variations do not unsettle a single article of Christian faith and duty; they only establish the essential integrity of the apostolic text, and increase the facilities of determining, approximately, the original reading, without resorting (as is the case with classical authors) to precarious subjective conjectures. On the most important variations which affect the sense, and which alone deserve consideration in a *popular* version, the leading critics of the day are now quite or nearly agreed. From the uncial MSS. (especially the two oldest, the Sinaitic and the Vatican, or ℵ and B, both made accessible now to all by the quasi fac-simile editions of Tischen-

* Tyndale used the edition of Erasmus, the Geneva revisers the Latin version of Beza (first ed. 1557). Comp. Westcott, *Hist. of the Eng. Bible*, p. 288. On the precise Greek text from which King James's revision is derived, see the NOTE below. On the Continent, the first Elzevir or Leyden edition of 1624 (from which the second edition of 1633 differs very slightly) is understood to be the 'received text;' while in England the term is more frequently applied to the third edition of Robert Stephens, which appeared in 1550, called the 'royal edition.' The Greek text in both is substantially the same. Including minute variations in orthography, they differ in 278 places (Scrivener, *N. T.* Cambr. 1860, p. vi.; Westcott, in Smith's *Bibl. Dict.* iii. 2132, Am. edit.). Where the Elzevir edition differs from Stephens, it generally agrees with Beza.

† Beza had, it is true, two uncial codd., viz., Codex D or Bezæ, of the Gospels and Acts, and Cod. D Claromontanus, of the Epistles, and knew also the Peshito and Arabic versions, but he made very little use of them, being more concerned for his Latin translation and notes. His immediate successors neglected even these important sources of criticism.

‡ Mr. Scrivener (*Introd. to Bibl. Crit.*, p. 225) states the total number of manuscripts of the Greek Testament known and used to be 1583, of which 127 are uncial, 1456 cursive, but most of the uncial and many of the cursive MSS. are incomplete, and 67 must be deducted for being counted double.

dorf and Vercellone), the earliest versions (especially the Itala, Vulgate, and Peshito), and the quotations of the Nicene and ante-Nicene fathers (Origen, Tertullian, Irenæus, etc.), we are now able to reconstruct, with a tolerable degree of certainty, the oldest attainable text, which is, upon the whole, much simpler and stronger than the post-Nicene and mediæval *textus receptus*, and free from liturgical and other glosses.

This ante-Nicene text should be made the basis of the revision, at least in all such cases where, as Ellicott says, 'critical evidence and the consent of the best editors point out the necessity of the change.'

This canon must, of course, exclude the spurious passage of the three witnesses, 1 John v. 7, which was omitted also at first by Erasmus, Luther, and Tyndale.* The doxology of the Lord's Prayer, Matt. vi., will be less easily surrendered. Sections which seem to be part of primitive apostolic tradition, though not of apostolic composition, as the conclusion of Mark (xvi. 9-20), and the pericope, John vii. 53, to viii. 11, may be retained in brackets or in italics. In debatable readings, where the witnesses are equally or almost equally divided, as between *μονογενὴς θεός* and *μονογενὴς υἱός*, John i. 18, the reading of the textus receptus should be retained, but the variation marked on the margin. Sometimes doubtful readings of great doctrinal importance receive new confirmation, as *τοῦ θεοῦ* (for *κυρίου*) in Acts xx. 28, which is sustained by Aleph and B, and furnishes one of the strongest arguments for the divinity of Christ, amply compensating for the loss of *θεός* for *ὅς* in 1 Tim. iii. 16 (probably a quotation from a primitive Christian hymn).† The genuineness of the Epistle to the Ephesians receives new support from the Sinaitic MS. by its omission of the words 'in Ephesus' in the address (i. 1), as it corroborates the view that it was a circular letter, and therefore free from those personal allusions and salutations which we should otherwise expect.

The text of the Apocalypse, of which we have fewer sources than of any other book of the N. T., has been cleared up in several important passages by the Codices Alexandrinus (A), Ephræmi Syri rescriptus (C), Sinaiticus (ℵ), Vaticanus No. 2066, a manuscript of the seventh or eighth century, called B of the Apocalypse (the great Cod. B Vaticanus does not contain the Apocalypse), the uncial palimpsest (P) discovered and made legible by Tischendorf in 1862,‡ and published in the sixth volume of his *Monumenta sacra inedita* (1869), and the rediscovery by Prof. Delitzsch of Reuchlin's Codex§—the only one for the Apocalypse which Erasmus used for his first edition, and used with

* Tyndale's edition of 1534, as given in Bagster's *English Hexapla*, has the disputed passage in italics.

† Tischendorf, however, in his 8th crit. ed., gives the preference to *κυρίου*, on the authority of A, C*, D, E, Irenæus (Lat. *interpr.*), etc.

‡ When Tischendorf applied his chemical process to the palimpsest, the Greek Archimandrite (now Bishop) Porfiri Uspenski, who had brought this and other MSS. from his Oriental travels, exclaimed '*Ecce Lazarus e sepulchro redux!*'

§ See Delitzsch, *Handschriftliche Funde*, 1861 and 1862. Tregelles has also examined this Codex, which was found in the library of the Prince of Œttingen-Wallerstein.

great haste. I will mention a few examples. In ch. i. 9, 'who am also your brother,' the improper '*also*' rests on a mere misunderstanding of Erasmus's copyist. In ch. i. 11, the words 'which are in Asia' are an interpolation of Erasmus from the Vulgate: *quæ sunt in Asia*. Similar additions of Erasmus from the Latin, which have no support in the Greek text, are found in ch. ii. 3 ('and hast not fainted,' '*et non defecisti*'), in ii. 20 ('a few things,' '*pauca*'), in ii. 24 (the disturbing '*and*'), and in several other passages. In ch. v. 10, the Greek reads 'thou hast made *them* (*αὐτούς*, i. e. the four and twenty elders) kings (a kingdom) and priests unto our God,' and '*they*' (the elders) 'shall rule (*βασιλεύσουσιν*) upon the earth;' but the A. V. turns '*them*' into '*us*,' and '*they*' into '*we*,' because Erasmus followed here the later corrupted text of the Vulgate in opposition to Reuchlin's Greek MS. In xvi. 14, 'the kings of the earth and of the whole world,' the superfluous words '*of the earth and*' are to be traced to a mistake of the transcriber, as the Greek reads simply *τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅλης*. In ch. xvii. 8, the perplexing translation, 'the beast that was, and is not, and *yet is*' (from the false reading *καίπερ ἔστι*), must now be corrected into 'the beast that was, and is not, and yet *shall come*' (the best authorities reading *καὶ πάρεσται* —Cod. Sin. *καὶ πάλιν πάρεσται, shall come again*. Compare *μέλλει ἀναβαίνειν ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου*, in the preceding clause).*

Note on the Greek Text of the English Version.—It is a question of some interest and importance to ascertain what edition of the Greek text was chiefly used by King James's translators. They left us no direct information; they paid little or no attention to textual criticism, which was then in its infancy, but we know what resources were then available. As they finished their work (1611) thirteen years before the first Elzevir edition (1624) appeared, they must have used the later editions of Stephens and Beza, which had then superseded the editions of Erasmus.

The third edition of Robert Stephens, called *editio regia*, was printed in Paris, and the fourth at Geneva, 1551; the latter, with the exception of a few passages, is a mere reprint, in inferior style, but it is the first which contains our versicular division. The text of Stephens (1550) has often been reproduced in England, most recently by F. H. Scrivener (1860 and 1872), who gives also the readings of Beza (professedly of 1565; but see the letter of Prof. Abbot below), of the Elzevirs (1624), Tischendorf, Lachmann, and Tregelles.

From Beza there appeared, before his death (1603), four folio editions of the Greek Testament, including the Vulgate, his new Latin translation, and exegetical notes, printed by Henry Stephens at Geneva,† and dedicated to

* Comp. an art. of Dr. Conant on the *Greek Text of the Apocalypse*, in the *Baptist Quarterly*, vol. iv. No. 2, and Tregelles's *Apocalypse*, edit. 1844, and now his last edition, concluding his *Greek Testament*, 1872. Tischendorf has not yet completed the second volume of his eighth edition, which will contain the Apocalypse.

† We have from Beza also several *small* editions, which omit the Vulgate (except in the 3d ed.), and give marginal glosses extracted from his commentary. They are dedicated to Prince Condé. Reuss (*Geschichte des N.*

Queen Elizabeth, viz. edit. i. (called ii.*), A.D. 1565, which is based upon the fourth edition of Stephens; ed. ii. (iii.), 1582, much improved by the readings of the important Codices Bezæ (D Gosp.) and Claromontanus (D Epp.), and the comparison of the Peshito and Arabic versions; ed. iii. (iv.), 1589 (also under the date 1588), chiefly a reprint of the third; ed. iv. (v.), 1598, which differs but little from the third, is less accurate, and was reprinted at Cambridge, 1642.†

It is almost certain, at the outset, that the last editions of Beza were the main basis of the A. V., not only because they were the latest and best, but also because Beza, the surviving patriarch of the reformers, exerted, by his Latin version and exegetical notes, a marked influence upon our translators;‡ even his explanatory or harmonistic interpolations in Apoc. xi. 1 (*καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος εἱστήκει*); Matt. i. 11; John xix. 13, found a place in the text, or at least in the margin of the A. V.

A closer examination confirms this supposition; but there is as yet no agreement as to the precise extent to which the A. V. depends upon Beza, or sides with Stephens, or dissents from both. Scrivener (*A Supplement to the Authorized Version*, pp. 7, 8), Westcott (art. *New Test.* in Smith's *Bible Dict.* iii. 2132, note, Am. ed.), and Ellicott (*Revision of the N. T.* ch. ii.) maintain that the A. V. is derived from Beza's third (1582) or fourth (1589) edition, and from Stephens's third (1550) or fourth (1551), and that in some 60 places it sides with Beza against Stephens, in some 28 with Stephens against Beza, while it differs from both in less than half a dozen places. But according to Hudson (*Critical Greek and English Concordance of the N. T.* p. xiii.), who takes Beza's fifth edition (1598) as the basis, the A. V. agrees with Beza versus Stephens's third in about 80 places, with Stephens versus Beza in about 40, and departs from both in about a dozen places. Prof. Abbot, of Harvard University, who has access to all the editions of Beza (except the third, 1582) and Stephens, and who, of all American scholars, is best qualified to ascertain the facts in the case, has at my request carefully investigated this point, and kindly furnished me with another statement, which, though not professing to be absolutely exhaustive, is more complete and accurate than any that has hitherto been published, to the effect that 'the Authorized Version agrees with Beza's text of 1589 against Stephens's of 1550 in about 90 places; with Stephens against Beza in about 40; and in from 30 to 40 places, in most of which the variations are of a trivial character, it differs

---

*T.*) says that they vary in the text, and were printed in Geneva, though often erroneously assigned to Paris.

* Beza counts his Latin edition of 1557 (the title-page gives 1556, the last page 1557) as editio prima; but, as it does not give the Greek text, it ought not to be counted.

† Tregelles, Scrivener, Westcott, and Bleek (*Einleitung in d. N. T.* p. 776), following Mill and Michaelis, speak also of an edition of 1576. But there is no place for such an edition in either series of Beza's texts. Wetstein (*Proleg.* p. 146) and Reuss (*Geschichte des N. T.* p. 411) give the correct account.

‡ As he had done before upon the Genevan version (1557 and 1560). See the examples in Westcott's *History of the English Bible*, p. 294 seq.

from both.' With his permission, I will give the specifications from a letter to me, dated Cambridge, Mass., Sept. 23, 1872, for which he deserves the thanks of Biblical scholars:

'I. The A. V. agrees with Beza against Stephens in Matt. xxi. 7; xxiii. 13, 14. Mark vi. 29; viii. 14, 24; ix. 40; xii. 20; xiii. 28. Luke i. 35; ii. 22; iii. 23, 35 (vi. 9, trans. and note); viii. 29 (not trans.); x. 6 (not trans.), 22; xv. 26; xvii. 36; xx. 47. John viii. 25; xii. 17; xiii. 31; xvi. 33; xviii. 24. Acts (v. 24, trans. and note) ix. 35; xv. 32 (?); xvii. 25; xxii. 25; xxiv. 13, 14 (?), 18, 19; xxv. 5; xxvi. 3, 18; xxvii. 12, 13. Rom. vii. 6; viii. 11; xii. 11; xvi. 20, 27 (?). 1 Cor. v. 11; xv. 31. 2 Cor. iii. 1; v. 4; vi. 15; vii. 12, 16; x. 10; xi. 10; xiii. 4. Eph. vi. 7. Col. i. 2, 24; ii. 13. 1 Thess. (ii. 13, trans. and note) ii. 15. 2 Thess. ii. 4. 1 Tim. i. 4. Tit. ii. 10. Heb. ix. 1, 2; x. 10; xii. 22, 23, *punct.* James ii. 18; iv. 13[a], 13[b]; v. 12. 1 Pet. i. 4; ii. 21; iii. 11, 21 (?). 2 Pet. iii. 7. 1 John i. 4; ii. 23 (A. V. in italics); iii. 16. 2 John 3. 3 John 7. Jude 19, 24. Rev. ii. 14; iii. 1; v. 11; vii. 3, 10; viii. 11; xi. 1, 2, 14; xiii. 3; xiv. 18; xvi. 5, 14. In Dr. Westcott's list, in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible* [art. *New Test.*], Acts xxi. 8; Rev. vii. 2, 14; xvii. 4, and in Scrivener's list (*Supplement to the Auth. Version*, p. 8), Rev. xix. 14, seem to be erroneously placed here. Matt. ix. 33; Acts i. 4, are uncertain.

'II. The A. V. agrees with Stephens, in preference to Beza's text of 1589, in Matt. i. 23 (vi. 1, Beza's trans. and note; his text is Stephens's). Mark i. 21; xvi. 14 (?), 20. Luke vii. 45; ix. 15. John iv. 5; xviii. 20. Acts ii. 36; iv. 25, 27, 36; vii. 16; xvi. 7, 17; xxi. 11; xxv. 6; xxvi, 8, *punct.* Rom. i. 29; v. 17; viii. 21, *punct.*; xi. 28. 1 Cor. vii. 29, xi. 22, *punct.*; xv. 55. 2 Cor. i. 6; iii. 14 (?); viii. 24. Gal. iv. 17. Phil. i. 23; ii. 24; iii. 20. Col. i. 2. 1 Tim. vi. 15. 2 Tim. ii. 22. Tit. ii. 7. Heb. ix. 28; x. 2. James iii. 6. 1 Pet. v. 10. 2 Pet. i. 1 (*σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*). Rev. vi. 12; ix. 19 (but Beza's trans. and note agree with Stephens). In Dr. Westcott's list, 1 Pet. ii. 21; iii. 21; 2 Pet. ii. 12; Rev. ix. 5; xii. 14; xiv. 2; xviii. 6; xix. 1, are wrongly placed here. 1 Cor. iii. 3; x. 28, adduced by Scrivener, appear to be merely cases of typographical error in Beza's text. Matt. xx. 15; 1 Cor. xi. 1; Rev. iv. 10, are not decisive.

'III. The A. V. follows a reading found neither in Stephens (1550) or Beza (1589), in Matt. ii. 11; x. 10. Mark iv. 18; vi. 4 (?); xiv. 43. Luke iii. 31; vi. 37 (Vulg.); viii. 31; xvii. 35; xx. 31, 32; xxii. 45 (?). John v. 5; vii. 9, 12; viii. 6, 42; ix. 25; xii. 13, 26, 34 (?); xvi. 25 (A. V. ed. 1611); xviii. 1 (?), 15 (?). Acts iii. 3; vi. 3 (?); vii. 44 (Vulg.); viii. 13; xix. 20 (Vulg.); xxi. 8 (Beza's trans. and note); xxvi. 6 (?); xxvii. 29. Rom. vi. 3 (mere oversight?). Eph. vi. 24 (A. V. ed. 1611). Phil. iv. 12. 1 Thess. v. 4 (Vulg.). Philem. 7. James iv. 15. 2 Pet. i. 1 (*Σίμων*, and *ἡμῶν* omitted after *θεοῦ*); ii. 9. Rev. vii. 2 (?); xvii. 4.

'A collation of Beza's fifth edition (1598) is given in Bagster's *Critical New Testament, Greek and English* (1842). That edition is not accurately printed, but the intentional changes from the text of 1589 are few.

'It is necessary to observe that the collation of Beza's edition of 1565, given by Scrivener in his *Introduction* (pp. 304–311) and in his Greek Testament, is not to be trusted. It agrees neither with the octavo nor the folio edition published by Beza in 1565. It is impossible that he should have used the text of either of those editions in making the collation which he has given. He has mistaken a copy of some other edition (perhaps wanting the title-page, or with a false title-page supplied) for the real Beza of 1565. The readings ascribed, in his *Introduction*, to Beza, 1565, differ from Beza's folio edition of that year in 111 places, but in only about 15 places from his octavo editions of 1580 and 1590. They do not agree so well with the edition of 1567. That of 1603 I have not seen.

'The erroneous references of Dr. Westcott pointed out above were apparently derived from Scrivener's collation; and in a note in the American edition of Smith's *Bible Dictionary* (p. 2132), misled by Scrivener, I wrongly referred them to Beza's text of 1565.' . . . . .

## 2. *Errors.*

### To correct acknowledged errors, whether of typography, or English Grammar, or translation.

(*a.*) MISPRINTS.

Examples: 'Strain *at* a gnat,' for 'strain *out*,' Matt. xxiii. 24 (*διυλίζοντες τὸν κώνωπα*);*—'*broidered*' (the ed. of 1611 and other early edd.: '*broided*'), for '*braided* (*plaited*) hair,' 1 Tim. ii. 9;—'and *she* went into the city,' for '*he*,' Ruth iii. 15 (see the Hebrew);—'awake my love, till *he* please,' for '*she*,' Cant. ii. 7 (in the Hebrew).

Many other typographical errors of the edition of 1611, which was far from being correct, have long since been silently removed by subsequent editions, in England and in America, yet not so as to secure uniformity; e. g.: '*hoops* of the pillars,' for '*hooks*' (Exod. xxxviii. 11); '*plaine*,' for '*plague*' (Lev. xiii. 56); '*fet*' the roll,' for '*fetch*' (Jer. xxxvi. 21); '*shewed* them by the prophets,' for '*hewed*' (Hos. vi. 5); '*rejected* verses,' for '*recited*' (Ecclus. xliv. 5); '*approved* to death,' for '*appointed*' (1 Cor. xii. 28); 'helps *in* governments,' for 'helps, governments' (1 Cor. xii. 28); '*vinegar*,' for '*vineyard*' (Luke xiii. 7, in the so-called 'vinegar edition' of Oxford, 1717).† The variations of the second edition, 1613, from the first, 1611, amount to about 375; in Dr. Blayney's edition of 1769, which is regarded as the standard edition, 116 errors were detected by the editors of the Eyre and Strahan edition, 1813. The committee appointed by the American Bible Society in 1848 found many errors and inconsistencies in the best English editions.‡

---

* Dean Alford, in his Commentary, defends the Authorized Version by the strained explanation: '*strain* (out the wine) *at* (the occurrence of) *a gnat*,' but in his English version of the Greek Testament (1869) he adopts *out* for *at*. All the other English versions (except that of Rheims) read 'strain *out*.' Bishop Lowth remarks: 'The impropriety of the preposition has wholly destroyed the meaning of the phrase,' which refers to the use of a strainer. See my annotations to Lange on *Matthew*, p. 408, note 16, p. 413.

† In a copy of the *second* issue of the edition of 1611 (in possession of Dr. Eadie, at Glasgow) I saw even *Judas* for *Jesus* in Matt. xxvi. 36. In the *first* issue, twenty-one words of Exod. xiv. 10 are printed twice. In an edition of 1613, the word *not* is omitted in Lev. xix. 10; 1 Cor. xi. 17; and 2 Tim. iv. 16.

‡ See the *Report of the History and Recent Collation of the English Version of the Bible: presented by the Committee on Versions to the Board of Managers of the American Bible Society, and adopted May* 1, 1851, p. 11 seq. The Committee on Versions (including such scholars as Drs. Edward Robinson, Samuel H. Turner, and John M'Clintock) spent three years of labor and pains in correcting misprints, and improving the orthography, cap-

The words '*ware* of' (Acts xiv. 6; Matt. xxiv. 50; Neh. x. 31), for '*aware* of' (Cant. vi. 12; Jer. l. 24; Luke xi. 44); '*horse* bridles,' for '*horses*' bridles' (so the Greek), Rev. xiv. 20; comp. '*horse heels*,' Gen. xlix. 17, and '*horse hoofs*,' Judges v, 22; and '*throughly*,' for '*thoroughly*,' which have been corrected in some editions, are not misprints, but archaisms. The same is true of 'John Baptist,' for 'John *the* Baptist' (comp. Matt. xiv. 8; xvi. 14; xvii. 13; Mark vi. 24, 25; viii. 28; Luke vii. 20, 28, 33, in Tyndale, Cranmer, the Genevan, and the Bishops' Bible); '*diddest*,' for '*didst*' (in Acts vii. 28, found also in Tyndale, Cranmer, the Genevan, and the Bishops' Bible), '*sometimes*,' for '*some time*' (i. e. once, formerly, Eph. v. 8). But these archaisms should all be removed, and they have been corrected in many editions.

(*b.*) Errors of ENGLISH GRAMMAR (which is not as good as the vocabulary of the Authorized Version).

Examples: *Cherubims* (confusion of Heb. with Eng. plural), for *cherubim* or *cherubs;* as also *seraphims*, *Nethinims*, *Anakims* (Gen. iii. 24; Isa. vi. 2, 6; Heb. ix. 5, etc.).—'*Whom* say ye that I am,' for *Who* (Matt. xvi. 15; Mark viii. 27, 29).—*His* (archaic), for *its* (Matt. v. 13; Mark ix. 50; Luke xiv. 34, etc.).—'This people who *knoweth* not,' for '*know* not' (John vii. 49).—'Ye should have hearkened unto me . . . and *to* have gained,' etc., for 'and (*so*) have gained,' etc. (Acts xxvii. 21).

(*c.*) MISTRANSLATIONS.

Matt. v. 21, 27, 33, '*by* them of old time,' instead of '*to* them' (τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, *to the ancients*, is taken as *dative* by all the English versions except the Authorized, which followed Beza; the *ablative* use is very rare and questionable).

Matt. x. 4, and Mark iii. 18, 'Simon the *Canaanite*,' instead of 'Simon of *Cana*' (the village in Galilee, which, however, would require Κανίτης rather than Κανανίτης), or, better, 'the *Zealot*' (=Ζηλωτής), compare Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13; Numb. xxv. 11. The American Bible Society's edition of 1852 had substituted *Cananite*, which was afterward changed back to *Canaanite*.

Matt. xiv. 8, 'And she being *before instructed* (from the Vulgate *præmonita*) of her mother,' instead of '*instigated* (or *led on*, *induced*, *aufgestachelt*, *angestiftet*, προβιβασθεῖσα) by her mother.'

Matt. xxviii. 19, 'Baptizing them *in* the name of the Father,' etc., instead of '*into* the name' (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, not ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι), i. e. into the covenant relationship and communion with the triune God. So also 1 Cor. i. 13, 'baptized *in* the name of Paul,' for '*into*' (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλου); Acts viii.

---

ital letters, words in italics, punctuation, and headings of columns and chapters, but the American Bible Society was induced by a majority of its managers to cancel the revised edition thus prepared (1852), on the ground of alleged want of constitutional authority, and popular dissatisfaction with a number of the changes made, especially in the headings of chapters (as substituting *Messiah* and *Sion*, in the O. T., for *Christ* and *Church*). Some fruits of their labor, however, remain, and many inconsistencies in the spelling of proper names, in the use of the vocative *O* and the optative *oh*, and of the indefinite article (now *a* house, *a* hill, *a* holy, now *an* house, etc.), are rectified in the editions of the American Bible Society since 1860. See the *Report of the Committee on Versions*, appointed in 1858.

15; xix. 5. The false rendering of the English and other versions arises from the Vulgate (*in nomine;* Tertullian had it correctly *in nomen*); but in other passages on baptism the English Version renders the preposition εἰς correctly, viz. Rom. vi. 3, 4; 1 Cor. x. 2; xii. 13; Gal. iii. 27; Acts xix. 3.*

Luke xxiii. 15, 'nothing worthy of death *is done unto* him' (ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ), for '*hath been done by* him' (Jesus).

John viii. 58, 'Before Abraham *was*, I am,' instead of '*was born*,' or '*made*,' or '*became*.' There is an important distinction between γενέσθαι, which signifies *temporal* or *created* existence, beginning in time and presupposing previous non-existence, and εἶναι, which expresses here, in the present tense, the *eternal, uncreated* existence of the Divine Logos. The same distinction is observed in the prologue of John, where ἦν is applied to the Logos, ver. 1, ἐγένετο to the genesis of the world, ver. 3, the birth of John the Baptist, ver. 6, and the incarnation of the Logos, ver. 14.†

John x. 16, 'one *fold* (following the *ovile* of the Vulgate, which might favor a narrow ecclesiasticism) *and* one shepherd,' instead of 'there will be one *flock* (μία ποίμνη, not αὐλή; comp. ver. 16), one shepherd.' (Tyndale was correct here.)‡

John xiii. 2, '*Supper* being *ended*' (which is inconsistent with ver. 12 and ver. 26, where the meal is still going on), for '*the meal* (δεῖπνον was the principal meal of the ancients, and corresponds to our late *dinner*) *being about to begin*,' or '*having begun*' (γινομένου, *al.* γενομένου).

John xiv. 18, '*comfortless*,' for '*orphans*' (ὀρφανούς).

John xvi. 8, '*reprove*,' for '*convince*' (ἐλέγχειν, which implies both a *convincing* unto salvation and a *convicting* unto condemnation.

Acts ii. 47, 'such as *should be saved*,' instead of '*were being saved*,' or 'were in the way of salvation' (τοὺς σῳζομένους, which signifies a progressive condition, not a final determination).

Acts xii. 4, '*Easter*' (a heathen or Christian festival), for the Jewish '*Passover*' (πάσχα).

Acts xvii. 22, 'in all things ye are too *superstitious*,' instead of '*very religious*' (δεισιδαιμονεστέρους; Beza correctly: *religiosiores*, De Wette: *sehr gottesfürchtig*). The A. V. makes Paul commence his address to the Athenians, contrary to his custom, with a reproach or an insult, while, in fact, he compliments them for their *religiousness*, with a delicate hint of their excess in a wrong direction, and makes this the starting-point for preaching to them the '*unknown* God,' whom 'they worshipped' (not '*ignorantly*,' but) '*unknowingly*' or '*unknowing*' (ἀγνοοῦντες, with evident allusion to ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ).

Rom. i. 20, 'his eternal power and *Godhead*,' for *godhood, divinity, divine majesty* (*Göttlichkeit*, θειότης, not θεότης).

Rom. iii. 25, 'for the *remission* of sins,' instead of '*prætermission*,' or, as

* See Alford, *in loc.*, and my annotations in Lange on *Matthew*, p. 558.

† Comp. my annotations in Lange on *John*, p. 54, 64, 79, 298.

‡ Alford, *in loc.*: 'The μία ποίμνη is remarkable—not μία αὐλή, *as characteristically but erroneously rendered* in the English Version: not *one fold*, but *one flock;* no one exclusive inclosure of an outward Church, but one flock, all knowing the one Shepherd, and known of him.' Comp. my remarks in Lange on *John*, p. 323.

the margin of the A. V. has it, '*the passing over*' (*πάρεσις*, not to be confounded with *ἄφεσις*).

Rom. xiii. 2, and 1 Cor. xi. 29, '*damnation*' (altogether too strong), instead of '*judgment*' (*κρίμα*, not *κατάκριμα*).

1 Thess. v. 22, 'abstain from all *appearance* of evil' (so also Luther, Calvin, Grotius, Wordsworth, but contrary to the meaning of *εἶδος*), instead of 'every *form*,' or 'all *kind* of evil' (correct in the Geneva Version).

2 Thess. ii. 7, 'the mystery of *iniquity*,' for '*lawlessness*' (*μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας*).

1 Tim. vi. 5, 'gain is godliness,' instead of 'godliness is gain' (as Coverdale renders *πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν*; comp. for a similar position of the predicate without the article John i. 1, *θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*, and iv. 24, *πνεῦμα ὁ θεός*).

1 John v. 15, 'He *hear* us' (which may be a misprint, or an old use of the subjunctive), for '*heareth*' (*ἀκούει*).

Heb. ii. 16, 'He *took* not *on him the nature* of angels; but he *took on him* the seed of Abraham,' a double error, instead of 'he *helpeth, doth help*,' or '*rescue, deliver, lay hold upon*' (which is the true meaning of *ἐπιλαμβάνεται*, now generally adopted in place of the older interpretation).*

Heb. xi. 13, '*embraced* them' (the promises), for '*greeted*' or '*hailed*' them from afar (*μὴ λαβόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀλλὰ πόρρωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες, καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι*, and thus dying *κατὰ πίστιν*, to embrace and enjoy the promises hereafter).

The frequent word *δαιμόνιον*, *a demon* or *evil spirit*, is usually rendered *devil* (Matt. vii. 22; ix. 33, 34; x. 8; xii. 24, and often), and *δαιμόνιον ἔχειν*, *to have a devil*, and thus the distinction between the Prince of darkness (*ὁ διάβολος, ὁ Σατανᾶς*) and his subordinate servants is obliterated. The phrase *δαιμόνιον ἔχειν* refers to the popular belief in demoniacal possessions, and is malignantly applied to Christ, John viii. 48, 49; x. 20, 21; but in the passage John vii. 20 it seems used of Christ, and Matt. xi. 18 of John the Baptist, compassionately in the milder sense, 'he has a spirit of melancholy, he labors under a hallucination.'

*Ἀνακλίνομαι* and *ἀνάκειμαι*, to *recline*, at table (on a couch or triclinium, according to the well-known Oriental custom, are falsely rendered to *sit* or *sit down* (Matt. viii. 11; ix. 10; Mark xiv. 18; Luke vii. 36; xiii. 29, etc.).

The coins, weights, and measures are very loosely translated, as *δραχμή* (an Attic silver coin equal to the Roman *denarius*, worth about 16 American cents) by '*piece*' of silver, *δίδραχμον* (a double drachm or half shekel of the Jews) by *tribute-money*, *tribute* (Matt. xvii. 24), and *στατήρ* (double the former, or equivalent to a Jewish shekel) by '*a piece of money*' (Matt. xvii. 27); but more frequently they are mistranslated. So *δηνάριον* (*denarius*), a Roman silver coin equivalent to the Attic drachma, used in the Gospels almost always for a *large* sum (Matt. xx. 2, 9, 10, 13; xxii. 19; Mark vi. 37; xiv. 5; Luke vii. 41; John vi. 7; xii. 5; Rev. vi. 6), is translated *penny*, when *franc* or *shilling* would come much nearer its absolute, and falls far short of its relative, value at the time of Christ. A '*penny*' would indeed be miserable wages for a day's labor (Matt. xx. 2), and 'three hundred *pence*' a poor sum

* See notes of Moll and Kendrick in Lange on *Hebrews*, Am. ed. pp. 60, 69.

for the precious ointment of Mary, in her ever-memorable deed of love (John xii. 5). *Denáry* would require a marginal note; *silverling* (or *silver-piece*), though rather indefinite, might be used, as it is found in the A.V. in Isa. vii. 23.*

'Ασσάριον, a *penny* (its exact value is a cent and a half), and κοδράντης (*quadrans*), *farthing* (*Heller*), are both translated alike, although the latter is only one fourth part of the former. '*Measure*' is used for χοῖνιξ (about a quart), σάτον, a satum or seah, βάτος, the bath or ephah, and κόρος, a cor or homer (equal to 15 bushels English), though the σάτον is one third of the βάτος, and βάτος one tenth of the κόρος.

## 3. *Inaccuracies.*

To rectify inexact and imperfect renderings, which obscure, or weaken, or modify the sense intended by the sacred writer.

These cases are far more numerous than positive errors, though often scarcely less injurious. They may be classified under the following heads:

(*a.*) OMISSION OF THE ARTICLE.

Matt. iv. 5, '*a* pinnacle,' for '*the* pinnacle (τὸ πτερύγιον) of the Temple.'

Matt. v. 1, and other places, '*a* mountain,' instead of '*the* mountain' (τὸ ὄρος).

Matt. xii. 41, 'rise up in judgment,' for 'in *the* j.' (comp. ver. 42, where the article is correctly retained in the A. V.).

Matt. xxiv. 12, 'the love of many shall wax (grow) cold,' instead of 'the love of *the* many' (τῶν πολλῶν), i. e. the vast majority of the disciples.

John vi. 4, 'the Passover, *a* feast of the Jews,' instead of '*the* (great) feast' (ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων).

John xii. 13, 'They took branches of palm-trees,' where the original reads '*the* branches of *the* palm-trees' (of the Mount of Olives).

Rom. v. 15, 17, 18, 19, 'one' and 'many' (opposed to *few*), for '*the* one,' ὁ εἷς (i. e. Adam the one transgressor on one hand, and Christ the one restorer on the other), and '*the* many,' οἱ πολλοί (i. e. the mass, the whole race, πάντες ἄνθρωποι, ver. 12). The omission of the article in this important passage weakens the antithesis and obscures the idea of the sufficiency and universal intent of Christ's redemption.

Rom. v. 9, 'saved from wrath,' instead of '*the* wrath' to come (ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς). Correct in 1 Thess. ii. 16.

1 Cor. ix. 5, 'as well as other apostles,' instead of '*the* other apostles' (οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι).

Col. i. 19, 'all fulness,' instead of '*the* whole fulness' (πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα), i. e. the plenitude or totality of divine powers.

2 Thess. ii. 3, 'except *a* falling away,' for '*the* falling away,' i. e. the great apostasy (ἡ ἀποστασία).

1 Tim. vi. 12, 13, '*a* good profession,' for '*the* good profession.'

2 Tim. iv. 7, 8, 'fought *a* good fight . . . . *my* course . . . . *a* crown of

* See my annotation to Lange on *Matthew*, p. 332, textual note [1].

righteousness,' for '*the* good fight. . . . . *the* course . . . . . *the* crown of righteousness.'

Heb. xi. 10, 'he looked for *a* city which hath foundations,' instead of 'he was looking (ἐξεδέχετο, imperf.) for *the* (heavenly) city which has *the* foundations' (τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν πόλιν); comp. xii. 22; Rev. xxi. 14, 19, 30.

Rev. vii. 14, 'they which come out of great tribulation,' for '*the* great tribulation' (ἐκ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλης); comp. Matt. xxiv. 22, 29; Dan. xii. 1.

The article is often neglected before νόμος in the Romans and Galatians, where it designates the written Mosaic law, in distinction from νόμος, the unwritten, abstract, and universal law; and in the Gospels before *Christ*, ὁ Χριστός, the long-expected Messiah of the Jews (e. g. Matt. ii. 4; xi. 2; xvi. 16; xxiv. 5; Luke xxiii. 35, 39).

Although the English idiom does not always admit the article where it is in the Greek, yet it is generally safe to render it whenever it is emphatic, or when it appears after a preposition, though there are exceptions, e. g. Matt. iii. 13 (ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην). King James's revisers seem to have followed too often the Latin Version, where the article disappears.

(*b.*) Insertion of the definite article where there is none in the Greek.

Matt. xxvii. 54, '*the* Son of God,' for '*a* Son of God' (comp. the parallel passage, Luke xxiii. 47, '*a righteous man*').

John iv. 27, 'with *the* woman,' as if the impropriety was in Christ's speaking with this particular woman of Samaria, while the disciples, without knowing her character, took offense at his talking with *a* woman (μετὰ γυναικός), i. e. with any woman, contrary to the rabbinical rule.

Acts xxvi. 2, 'accused of *the* Jews' (as if all were included).

Rom. ii. 14, 'When *the* Gentiles which have not the law observe by nature,' etc., instead of 'When Gentiles;' ἔθνη, i. e. some, not all.

1 Thess. iv. 17, 'caught up together with them in *the* clouds,' instead of 'in clouds' (ἐν νεφέλαις).

1 Tim. vi. 10, 'the love of money is *the* root of all evil;' as if it was the only one, while the apostle calls it simply '*a* root' (ῥίζα) among other fruitful roots, as pride, hatred, idolatry, intemperance, from which every form of moral evil may spring.

(*c.*) Neglect of prepositions.

The prepositions ἐν (*in*, signifying rest) and εἰς (*into*, signifying motion), the διά with the genitive (instrumental, *through*, *by means* of, etc.) and διά with the accusative (indicating the moving cause, *because of*, *on account of*), ἐκ (=*ex*, *out of*, *from*, origin, motion out of), ἀπό (=*ab*, *from*, remoter than ἐκ) and ὑπό with genitive (*from under*, *by*), are very often confounded, to the serious injury of the sense.

We have already mentioned, under a previous head, the exchange of εἰς for ἐν in the baptismal formula, which amounts to a mistranslation.

Luke xxiii. 42, the Greek requires 'comest *in* thy kingdom' ('*regno jam acquisito*', as Maldonatus observes; comp. Matt. xxv. 31: 'When the Son of man shall come in his glory,' etc.), instead of '*into* thy kingdom.'

Rom. xi. 2, ἐν Ἠλίᾳ, '*in* (the history of) Elijah,' not '*of* Elias.'

Phil. ii. 10, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ, '*in* the name of Jesus,' instead of '*at* the name.'

In 2 Pet. i. 5–7 the omission of the preposition (ἐν τῇ πίστει—ἐν τῇ γνώσει, κ.τ.λ.) tends to turn the organic development of the Christian graces and their causal dependence one upon another into a mechanical accumulation.

In 1 Pet. ii. 12 and iii. 16 we have '*whereas*,' instead of '*wherein*' (ἐν ᾧ).

Ἐν is often wrongly translated *by* or *through*, where it signifies the life-element, as in the important Pauline phrases '*in* Christ,' '*in* the Lord,' '*in* the Spirit,' e. g. Rom. vi. 11; xiv. 14; xv. 16; 1 Cor. xii. 3, 9; while Rom. viii. 1, 2; ix. 1; xii. 5; xiv. 17; xvi. 2, 3, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13; 1 Cor. i. 2, etc., it is correctly rendered *in*.

(*d.*) NEGLECT OF PARTICLES.

Every careful reader of the Greek Testament, and of such commentators as Meyer, Fritzsche, Ellicott, knows how much the full force of Paul's argument depends upon a correct understanding and translation of the logical and argumentative particles, especially the illative ἄρα, ἄραγε, ἆρα οὖν, the simpler οὖν (most frequent in John), the adversative ἀλλά, etc. It is quite impossible, however, in the English language, to do full justice to the wealth of particles in which the Greek excels.

Examples: Gal. v. 11, '*then after all*' (ἄρα), for '*then;*' vi. 10, '*Accordingly then*, as we have opportunity' (ἄρα οὖν), for '*therefore*,' etc.; iii. 5, 'He *then* who is bestowing' (οὖν, resumptive), for '*therefore;*' so John xi. 6; and John vi. 60, '*now* many of his disciples' (οὖν, continuative), for 'many *therefore*,' etc.; so xi. 33; xii. 9; Rom. vii. 7, '*but* I had not known sin' (ἀλλά), for '*nay*,' etc.; Gal. iii. 22, '*but, on the contrary*' (ἀλλά), for '*but;*' Gal. v. 16, '*now* I say' (δέ), for 'This I say *then;*' 1 Tim. i. 8, '*now* we know' (δέ), for '*but;*' Gal. iii. 17, 'this, *however*, I say,' (δέ), for '*and*.'

(*e.*) NON-OBSERVANCE OF TENSES, MOODS, AND VOICES.

Aorists are very often confounded with perfects, perfects with aorists; imperfects are rendered as aorists and perfects; the changes of moods and voices are less frequent. A few examples must suffice.

The imperfect should be represented, Luke i. 59, 'they were *calling*' (ἐκάλουν), for '*called;*' Luke v. 6, 'their net *was breaking*,' or '*began to break*' (διερρήγνυτο), for '*brake;*' Luke xiv. 7, '*were choosing out*' (ἐξελέγοντο), for '*chose out;*' Acts iii. 1, '*were going up*' (ἀνέβαινον), for '*went up;*' Mark ii. 18, '*were fasting*' (ἦσαν νηστεύοντες), for '*used to fast;*' Gal. i. 13, '*was destroying*,' or '*wasting*' (ἐπόρθουν), for '*wasted;*' and ver. 23, 'which once he was *destroying*' (ἐπόρθει), for '*destroyed*.'

The aorist should be rendered, Matt. xxvii. 4, ἥμαρτον παραδοὺς αἷμα ἀθῶον, 'I *sinned* in betraying innocent blood' (which is in better keeping with the concise earnestness of the Greek and the desperate state of Judas than 'I *have* sinned in that I *have* betrayed *the* innocent blood'); Luke i. 19, ἀπεστάλην, 'I *was* sent,' instead of 'I *am* sent' (ἀπέσταλμαι); Mark xvi. 2, ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου, 'when the sun *was risen*,' instead of '*at the rising* of the sun;' Rom. v. 12, '*sinned*' (ἥμαρτον, '*omnes peccarunt peccante Adamo*,' Bengel), for '*have* sinned.'

The present should be restored in Heb. ii. 16, ἐπιλαμβάνεται, 'he *delivereth* not angels, but he *delivereth* the seed of Abraham,' instead of 'he *took* not *on him the nature* of angels, but he *took on him* the seed of Abraham.'

The perfect should be given in Luke xiii. 2, 'they *have suffered*' (in the past, πεπόνθασιν) such things, for 'they *suffered*.'

The passive should be restored, 2 Cor. v. 10, 'we must all *be made manifest* (φανερωθῆναι, exhibited as we are) before the judgment seat of Christ,' instead of '*appear*.'

(*f*.) Non-observance of the genitive, especially the genitive of quality, which is often weakened by the substitution of an adjective.

Rom. viii. 6, τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός, 'the mind of the flesh,' τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, 'the mind of the Spirit'—stronger than 'to be carnally minded,' 'to be spiritually minded.'

Rom. viii. 21, τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ, 'the liberty of the glory of the children of God,' for 'the glorious liberty.'

Phil. iii. 21, τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν, 'the body of our humiliation,' and τὸ σῶμα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, 'the body of his glory,' are weakened by the translation 'our vile body' and 'his glorious body.'

1 Tim. i. 11, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης, 'the gospel of the glory,' instead of 'the glorious gospel.'

(*g*.) Inadequate and insufficient renderings of words and phrases.

Matt. vi. 2, 6, ἀπέχουσι should be rendered 'they have *all*,' or 'have *in full*,' (*haben dahin*), *i. e.* they can expect no more. The A.V. treats it like the simple ἔχουσι.

Matt. xxi. 40, κακοὺς κακῶς (=*pessimos pessime*) ἀπολέσει, is a paronomasia of the purest Greek, bringing out the agreement of character with the punishment, and may be reproduced in English by '*he will miserably destroy those miserable men*,' or '*he will wretchedly destroy those wretches*' (as in German by *Elenden elendiglich*, or *schlimm* and *Schlimmen*, or *übel* and *Uebelthäter*), but the A.V. destroys it by '*miserably*—those *wicked* men.'

Matt. xxvii. 32, 'him (Simon of Cyrene) they *compelled* (for *impressed*) to bear his cross,' which makes the act appear as an arbitrary assumption of power, while ἀγγαρεύειν is the technical term for pressing men or horses into public service by authority.

Matt. xxvii. 44, 'Cast the same in his teeth,' for 'reproached him in like manner' (τὸ αὐτὸ . . . . ὠνείδιζον αὐτῷ).

Matt. xxvii. 49, '*Let be*' (a rebuke), for the hortatory '*Come, let us see*,' or simply '*Let us see*.' Ἄφες ἴδωμεν is a shortened popular form of expression for ἄφες ἵνα ἴδωμεν, like ἄφες ἐκβάλω in Matt. vii. 4 and Luke vi. 42. (See Buttmann's Gram. d. N. T. Sprache, p. 181 seq., and Moulton's note to his excellent translation of Winer, p. 356, note [3].) The elliptical or concise form of expression is like θέλεις εἴπωμεν; τί θέλετε ποιήσω; and the familiar omission of *ut* in Latin after *volo, sino*, etc.

Luke ii. 49, 'about my Father's *business*;' better, 'in my Father's *house*,' i. e. the temple.

John i. 14, '*dwelled* among us,' where *tabernacled*, or *pitched his tent* (Mey-

er and Ewald, *zeltete;* Godet, *a dressé sa tente*), would better render the obvious allusion of the verb ἐσκήνωσε to the σκηνή, or Shekinah (from שָׁכַן), and its typical appearance in the tabernacle and the temple of old, now actualized in the essential and permanent indwelling of the Divine δόξα in the person of the incarnate Logos. Comp. Apoc. vii. 15; xxi. 3.*

John i. 43 (in the English Bible, ver. 44 in the Greek), 'he *would* go,' for '*intended* to go' (ἠθέλησεν). The force of ἤθελειν is very often neglected. See Dict.

Rom. v. 18, '*righteousness*,' for '*righteous act*,' δικαίωμα (not δικαιοσύνη). In the same chapter, ver. 16, the word is translated '*justification*' (which would require δικαίωσις), while it means either *righteous act*, as in ver. 18, or *righteous sentence* (*Rechtsspruch*).†

Rom. vii. 23, '*another* law,' for a '*different* law' (ἕτερος, not ἄλλος), and Gal. i. 6, '*another* gospel,' for a '*different* gospel.' In both cases ἕτερος (*diversus*) is used, which means different in *kind*, while ἄλλος (*alius*) means another of the *same* kind.

1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 13, '*charity*' (from '*caritas*'), which is now used in a restricted sense, for the more comprehensive *love* (ἀγάπη) to *God* and man.

Gal. i. 6, 'Ye are so soon *removed* from him that called you *into* the grace of Christ unto *another* gospel,' instead of 'so soon *changing over* (μετατίθεσθε, middle, not passive) from him that called you *in* (or *by*, ἐν, not εἰς) the grace of Christ, unto a *different* gospel.'

Gal. i. 14, 'And profited in the *Jews' religion* above many my *equals;*' better, 'And surpassed in *Judaism* many *of my age*' (συνηλικιώτας). Verse 15, 'who *separated* me,' for '*set me apart.*'

Gal. i. 18, 'to *see* Peter,' for 'to *make the acquaintance*' (ἱστορῆσαι, which is more than ἰδεῖν) of *Cephas*' (the correct reading, as in ii. 9, 11, 14).

Gal. ii. 6, 'those who *seemed* to be somewhat' (the pillar apostles), for 'who were *deemed* somewhat,' or 'who *are of reputation.*'

Gal. ii. 11, 'he was to be *blamed*' (from the *reprehensibilis* of the Vulgate), for 'was *condemned*' (κατεγνωσμένος ἦν).

Eph. iv. 3, '*endeavoring*' (which, as *now* used, implies the possibility or probability of failure) 'to keep the unity of the Spirit,' etc., instead of the stronger '*giving all diligence*,' '*striving earnestly*' (σπουδάζοντες).

Col. i. 15, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως should be rendered 'begotten *before* every creature,' or '*before* the whole creation,' which is required by the context; for Christ is said to be before all things, and all things were made by him (ver. 16). The A.V., 'the first-born *of* every creature.' mistakes the genitive of comparison, or of the point of view (the genitive depends on πρῶτος, as πρῶτός μου, John i. 15, 30) for a partitive genitive, and might furnish an argument to Arianism, which regards Christ as the first creature (κτίσμα). But there is an important distinction between πρωτότοκος=πρωτόγονος, and πρωτόκτιστος, or πρωτόπλαστος.‡

The translation '*God* forbid,' for μὴ γένοιτο (Rom. iii. 4, 6), and 'I would

* See Lange on *John*, p. 71, textual note [1], and 73.

† Comp. on this difficult word, Rothe on *Romans* v. 12–21, and my edition of Lange on *Romans*, p. 184 seq.

‡ See the remarks of Meyer, Ellicott, and Braune—Riddle, *in loc.*

to *God*,' for ὄφελον (1 Cor. iv. 8), though strong and expressive (too much so), sounds profane to a modern ear, and ought to be changed.

### 4. *Inconsistencies.*

To introduce consistency and uniformity in the translation of words and phrases.

The defects under this head are closely allied to those under the preceding head, and are discussed with much care by Prof. Lightfoot.* Wherever the variation does not affect the sense or weaken the emphasis, we would allow considerable freedom and retain the traditional rendering. A mechanical uniformity would often mar the beauty or the rhythmical flow of diction, and do great injustice to the genius of the English language and its wealth in *bilingual duplicates*, which is one of its characteristic advantages and elements of power.† But the A. V. goes to an extreme in two opposite directions,

* Dr. Lightfoot is no doubt right in principle, notwithstanding the strictures of Mr. Erle in '*The Guardian*' for September 20, 1871, and January 10, 1872, and of an able reviewer in '*The London Quart. Review*' for July, 1872. The application of the principle is often a matter of taste and expediency.

† As '*act* and *deed*,' '*head* and *chief*,' '*might* and *power*,' '*justice* and *righteousness*,' '*royal* and *kingly*,' '*sacerdotal* and *priestly*,' '*mature* and *ripe*,' '*omnipotent* and *almighty*,' '*timely* and *early*,' '*desire* and *wish*,' '*sanctify* and *hallow*,' '*conceal* and *hide*,' '*constitute* and *make*,' '*baptize* (Greek, Latin) and *christen*' (Greek, Saxon). There is, however, mostly a shade of difference between the Saxon and the corresponding Norman-Latin terms, as between '*love*,' the affection of the heart toward God and man, and '*charity*,' love in active exercise toward our neighbor; '*freedom*,' the inherent power, and '*liberty*,' in opposition to previous servitude or restraint; '*readable*, which refers to the matter, and '*legible*,' which refers to the form or handwriting; between '*ox*,' '*calf*,' '*sheep*,' '*deer*,' which signify the animals in their natural state, and '*beef*,' '*veal*,' '*mutton*,' '*venison*,' which are used of the meat of these animals as prepared for the table of the Norman lord. The framers of the original portions of the Anglican Common Prayer-book, probably from a desire to reach the hearts of all classes of the people at a time when the condition of the language was not yet perfectly settled, made very frequent use of bilingual duplicates, as *acknowledge and confess, dissemble and cloak, humble and lowly, goodness and mercy, assemble and meet together, requisite and necessary, pray and beseech, remission and forgiveness, loving and amiable.* The Saxon is the democratic, the Norman the aristocratic element in the English language; the former gives it strength, the latter dignity; the Saxon supplies the vocabulary of common, every-day life, the Norman the vocabulary of rank and fashion; the one we need at home, the other in the courts of law, on the chase, and in polished society. The Saxon is the language in which we live and die, and express our deepest thoughts and feelings. It therefore very properly predominates in the Protestant versions of the English Bible since Tyndale, who excelled in the purest and most vigorous Saxon. What can be finer than such truly Saxon passages as 'My heart is smitten and withered like grass;' or, 'If heart and

by *creating false distinctions* not intended by the sacred writers, and by *obliterating real distinctions* which are more or less important. A glance into the '*Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament*' will furnish an abundance of examples.* The variation occurs often in the *same context* and even the *same verse*, where the repetition would be as beautiful and forcible as the repetition of *Blessed are* in the Sermon on the Mount. The revisers laid down, in their preface, the false and mischievous rule 'not to tie themselves to a uniformity of phrasing or to an identity of words,' lest they be charged 'with some unequal dealing toward a great number of English words.' Perhaps the transition state of the English language, and the desire to melt the Latin and Saxon elements, may have had something to do with this rule.

(*a.*) NEEDLESS OR INJURIOUS VARIATIONS.

αἰώνιος, in the important passage Matt. xxv. 46, is used in both clauses; and yet the A.V. has there '*everlasting* punishment' and 'life *eternal*.'

ἀποκάλυψις is rendered by *revelation*, Rom. ii. 5 (and in most other passages); *manifestation*, viii. 19; *coming*, 1 Cor. i. 7; *appearing*, 1 Pet. i. 7.

ἐλεῆσαι and ἠλέησα, in the same verse, Matt. xviii. 33, *have had compassion* and *had pity*.

ἐνεργεῖν, in the same verse, *worketh* and *to do*, Phil. ii. 13 ('God *worketh* to will and to *work*').

ἐπίσκοπος is uniformly translated (or transferred rather) *bishop* (Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 25), except in Acts xx. 28, where it is Anglicized into *overseers*, and thus one of the best arguments for the identity

---

flesh fail, thou art the strength of my heart and my portion (*lot*) for ever;' or the version of the twenty-third Psalm? In the Lord's Prayer some fifty-four words are Saxon, and the remaining six, which are of Latin origin (*trespasses*, *trespass*, *temptation*, *deliver*, *power*, *glory*), could easily be replaced by corresponding Saxon terms (*sins*, *sin*, *trial*, *free*, *might*, *brightness*). The Douay Bible has retained from the Vulgate '*supersubstantial* bread' for '*daily* bread!' The A.V., however, being the work of forty-seven scholars, is not uniform in the preponderance of Saxon, and the difference is quite marked. Comp. e. g. the concluding sentence of the Sermon on the Mount, as given by Matthew and Luke, and there can be not a moment's hesitation as to the superiority of the more Saxon rendering of Matthew.

| Matt. vii. 27. | Luke vi. 49. |
|---|---|
| 'And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell, and great was the fall of it.' | 'Against which the stream did beat *vehemently*, and *immediately* it fell; and the *ruin* of that house was great.' |

* Fifth. ed., London, 1868. This is a most useful book for the proper estimate of the Authorized Version, as it gives the passages in English, while retaining (from Bruder) the alphabetical order of the Greek words of the N. T. The same is true of '*The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament*,' third ed., London, 1866, 2 vols. It is more convenient for purposes of revision than Buxtorf and Fürst. Hudson's *Critical Greek and English Concordance of the New Testament*, 2d ed., Boston, 1871 (revised by Dr. E. Abbot), is also of special value for the work of revision.

of apostolic and primitive bishops and presbyters (comp. τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους, *the elders*, ver. 17, who are the same persons with the ἐπίσκοποι, ver. 28) is lost to the English reader.*

Θρόνος is *throne*, Rev. i. 4; iii. 21; iv. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and many other passages, when used of God and of Christ, but the θρόνοι of the twenty-four elders who reign with Christ in heaven are lowered into '*seats*,' iv. 4, and the θρόνος of Satan, ii. 13, as well as that of the beast from the abyss, xvi. 10, is likewise changed into a '*seat*,' and thus the intended antithetical correspondence between the infernal counterfeit and the heavenly original is destroyed.

λογίζομαι, in the sense *to impute*, a very important word in Paul's doctrine of declaratory or forensic justification, is rendered by three verbs in the same chapter, and in the same connection with δικαιοσύνη, viz. *to count*, Rom. iv. 3, 5; *to reckon*, iv. 5, 9, 10; to *impute*, iv, 6, 8, 11, 22, 23, 24.

καταλλαγή, *atonement*, Rom. v. 11; *reconciling*, xi. 15; *reconciliation*, 2 Cor. v. 18, 19.

κυριότης, *government*, 2 Pet. ii. 10, but in the parallel passage, Jude 8, *dignities*.

ζόφος, *darkness*, 2 Pet. ii. 4; *mist*, 2 Pet. ii. 17; and in the parallel passage, Jude 17, *blackness*.

παράκλητος, when used of the Holy Spirit, is rendered (with Wicliffe, Luther) *Comforter* (John xiv. 16, 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7); when used, in the same sense, of Christ, it is more correctly rendered (with the Vulgate) *Advocate* (1 John ii. 1). Grammatically, παράκλητος, being passive in form (one who is called in, or summoned to aid, a counsel for defense), can not well have the active meaning of *Consolator*, *Comforter* (which would require παρακλήτωρ), but the familiar *Comforter*, in old English, agreeably to its derivation from the Latin *comfortari*, implied the idea of *Strengthener*, *Supporter*, which comes nearer the meaning of *Advocate*, and expresses an important office of the Holy Spirit, so that it should better be retained, either in the text with *Advocate* in the margin, or *vice versa*.†

λόγος is represented in the A.V. by no less than twenty-eight different terms, viz. *cause*, *communication*, *saying*, *word*, *account*, *thing*, *talk*, *matter*, *question*, *fame*, *treatise*, *speaker* (Acts xiv. 12), *mouth* (xv. 27), *reason*, *speech*, *work*, *utterance*, *to say*, *tidings*, etc.

καταργέω occurs twenty-seven times in the N. T., and is rendered by seventeen different verbs, *to cumber*, *to make void*, *to make of none effect*, *to do away*, *to put down*, etc.

Ἕλλην, now *Greek*, now *Gentile*.

καυχάομαι is rendered *to make boast*, *to glory*, *to boast*, and *to rejoice*.

---

* In this case one feels tempted to suspect King James's revisers of Episcopal bias, since most of them probably agreed with him in the false principle, 'No bishop, no king.' The primitive identity of bishops and presbyters in the N. T. is now admitted by the best scholars of the Church of England. See Alford on *Acts* xx. 17, and Lightfoot's Excurs. in Comm. on *Philippians*.

† This question is fully discussed by Archdeacon Hare in his *Mission of the Comforter*, and by myself in Lange on *John*, pp. 440–442. Lightfoot (p. 55, Engl. ed.) strongly pleads for *Advocate* in all the passages. No word in the English language can express the full meaning of παράκλητος.

κηρύσσω, mostly *to preach*, but several times *to publish*, and once *to proclaim* (Rev. v. 2).

μαρτύρεω, *to charge, to give, to record, to witness*, and by other verbs.

παρακαλέω is rendered *to comfort, to beseech, to desire, to entreat, to exhort.*

πρόσκομμα, *offence, stumbling, stumbling-block, stumbling-stone.*

πρόσωπον, *appearance, before, countenance, face, fashion, men's persons, outward appearance, person, presence.*

πρόφασις, which occurs but seven times, is rendered *pretence* (3 times), *shew* (once), *cloke* (twice), *color* (once).

τύπος, which occurs in 15 passages (16 times), is given by 8 variations, viz. *print, figure, fashion, manner, form, example, ensample, pattern.*

μένω has 10, ὁρίζω 5, ὄχλος 6, παιδίσκη 5, πόλεμος 4, σπουδή 7, συνεργός 7, σώζω 7, ὑπάγω 6, ὑστερέω 9, φιλαδελφία 3, φέρω 16, χρεία 9, ψάλλω 3, ψυχή 8, ὥστε 9 different translations.

(*b.*) OBLITERATION OF IMPORTANT DISTINCTIONS.

ᾅδης, i. e. the whole invisible spirit-world, the receptacle of all the dead (*Unterwelt, Todtenreich*), corresponding to the Hebrew *Sheol*, is uniformly (11 times in the New Testament) translated *hell*, except once (1 Cor. xv. 55, *grave*), and thus confounded with γέεννα, which is likewise (in 12 places) so translated, and correctly, for gehenna means the eternal state and place of damnation and torment. The same confusion is found in Luther's and other versions, and hence the distinction between Hades or Sheol, and Hell, is almost lost in the popular mind, and Christ's descent into Hades is very little understood.

διάκονοι and δοῦλοι, in the parable, Matt. xxii. 1–14, are alike rendered *servants*, although the former are angels and the latter men.

θηρία and ζῶα, in the Apocalypse, iv. 6, 7, 8, 9; v. 6; vi. 1, etc., are alike translated '*beasts*;' yet the ζῶα are the heavenly representatives of all created life worshipping before the throne in heaven, and the very opposite of the θηρία, their hellish antagonists, which arise from the bottomless pit and demand idolatrous worship (vi. 8; xi. 7; xiii. 1 seq., 14 seq.; xiv. 9, etc.).

With all the wealth of the English language, one word is sometimes made to do service for half a dozen or more Greek terms, without regard to their nice and delicate shades of meaning.

*abide* stands for ἀναστρέφω, αὐλίζομαι, διατρίβω, ἐπιμένω, ἵστημι, καταμένω, μένω, παραμένω, ποιέω, ὑπομένω.

*acceptable* for ἀπόδεκτος, δεκτός, εὐάρεστος, εὐπρόσδεκτος, χάρις.

*accusation* for αἰτία, κατηγορία, κρίσις.

*affliction* for θλῖψις, κάκωσις, πάθημα.

*appear* for ἀναφαίνομαι, ἐμφανίζω, ἐπιφαίνω, ἔρχομαι, ὄπτομαι, φαίνω, φανερόω.

*bad* for κακός, πονηρός, σαπρός.

*bring forth* for ἀνάγω, ἀποκυέω, βλαστάνω, γεννάω, δίδωμι, ἐκβάλλω, ἐκφέρω, ἐξάγω, κατάγω, παραδίδωμι, ποιέω, προάγω, προφέρω, τίκτω, φέρω.

*but* for ἀλλά, γάρ, ἐάν, εἰ μή, ἐκτός, ἤ, μέντοι, μή, ἐὰν μή, μόνον, οὖν, πλήν.

*call* for ἐπικαλέομαι, ἐπιλέγομαι, ἔπω, ἐστί, καλέω, λέγω, μετακαλέομαι, ὀνομάζω, προσαγορεύομαι, προσκαλέομαι, αἰτέω, μετακαλέομαι, μεταπέμπω, παρακαλέω, προσκαλέομαι, φωνέω.

*child* for *βρέφος, νήπιος, παιδάριον, παιδίον, παῖς, τέκνον, υἱός.*

*choose* for *αἱρέομαι, αἱρετίζω, ἐκλέγομαι, ἐπιλέγομαι, προχειρίζομαι, χειροτονέω.*

*conversation* for *ἀναστροφή, τρόπος, πολίτευμα.*

*devil* for *διάβολος, δαίμων,* and *δαιμόνιον.*

*gift* for *ἀνάθημα, δόμα, δόσις, δωρεά, δώρημα, δῶρον, μερισμός, χάρις, χάρισμα.*

*worship* for *εὐσεβέω, θεραπεύω, λατρεύω, προσκυνέω, σεβάζομαι, σέβομαι.*

*come* stands for no less than 32 Greek verbs, *command* for 8, *consider* for 11, *continue* for 13, *declare* for 14, *desire* for 13, *depart* for 21, *dwell* for 5, *eat* for 6, *except* for 7, *finish* for 7, *fulfil* for 7, *give* for 14, *go* for 16, *know* for 7, *make* for 13, *mighty* for 7, *raiment* for 5, *perceive* for 11, *receive* for 18, *servant* for 7, *shame* for 6, *take* for 21, *think* for 12, *yet* for 10 different Greek words.

## 5. *Archaisms.*

To remove obsolete archaisms, and to substitute intelligible words and phrases.

There is a difference between *antique* and *antiquated* words and phrases. The former should be retained, the latter be removed. Archaisms which, though seldom or never used in modern English, are still intelligible, may even enhance the solemnity and pungency of the Bible diction, which ought to soar above the vulgarity and familiarity of common speech. Here belong such words as 'list,' 'travail,' 'twain,' 'forasmuch,' 'howbeit;' the ending 'eth' for 's' in the third person singular of the verb; the old preterites 'clave,' 'brake,' 'sware;' such phrases as 'well stricken in years,'* 'threescore years and ten.'

Antiquated archaisms are:

(*a.*) WORDS WHICH HAVE GONE MORE OR LESS OUT OF USE, AND ARE NOT UNDERSTOOD BY THE PEOPLE: *taches, ouches, knops, neesings, daysman* (in the O. T.), *all to* (for *altogether*, in Judges ix. 53, 'and *all to* brake his skull,' with no corresponding word in Hebrew), *goodman* (for *householder*, Matt. xxi. 11; comp. ver. 1), *Jewry* (for *Judæa*, John vii. 1; Luke xxiii. 5).

(*b.*) WORDS WHICH ARE STILL USED, BUT HAVE CHANGED THEIR MEANING: *to prevent*, in the sense of *prævenire, to come before, to anticipate* (Matt. xvii. 25, *προέφθασεν*); *to let*, in the sense *to hinder* (2 Thess. ii. 7); *charger* (now mostly used for a horse in battle), in the sense of *platter* (Matt. xiv. 8); *carriages*, for *baggage* (Acts xxi. 15); robbers of *churches*, for robbers of (heathen) *temples* (*ἱερόσυλοι*, Acts xix. 37); *nephews*, for *grandchildren* or *descendants* (*ἔκγονα*, 1 Tim. v. 4); *to offend*, for *cause to stumble* (*σκανδαλίζω*, often); and *offence*, for *stumbling-block*, scandal, *cause* of sinning or *ruin* (*σκάνδαλον*, Matt. xviii. 7, etc.); '*generation* of vipers,' for *brood, offspring* (*γενεά*); *devotions*, for *idols* or objects of devotion (*σεβάσματα*, Acts xvii. 23); 'not slothful in *business*,' for *diligence* (Rom. xii. 11, *τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροί*; comp. ver. 8); *conversation*, in the sense of deportment, moral conduct (Phil. i. 27, for *πολιτεύεσθε, let your conversation be;* Phil. iii. 20, for *πολίτευμα*,

* David Hume, in his brief autobiography, uses this phrase of himself.

which is mistaken for *ἀναστροφή*, also by Luther, but means either *country*, *commonwealth*, or *citizenship*); '*take no thought* for your life,' for *anxious* thought, or *be not troubled about* (*μὴ μεριμνᾶτε*, Matt. vi. 25, 31, 34); '*occupy* till I come,' for *trade ye* (*πραγματεύσασθε*, Luke xix. 13; comp. ver. 15); *coast*, frequently for *border* or *region*; *quarrel*, for *complaint* (*querela*, Col. iii. 13); *dishonesty*, for *shame* (2 Cor. iv. 2); *instantly*, in the sense of *urgently* (Luke vii. 4); 'I know nothing *by* myself' (perhaps a mistranslation), for '*against* myself' (1 Cor. iv. 4, *οὐδὲν ἐμαυτῷ σύνοιδα*); '*do to wit*' (2 Cor. viii. 1), for '*make known*;' '*careful*' (Phil. iv. 6), for '*anxious*.'

'To yield up the *ghost*' should give way, in Matt. xvii. 50, to 'yielded up *his spirit*,' as the former is now used in a low or less serious sense.

As to the familiar *which* for *who* when referring to *persons*, the majority of American revisers would probably prefer the change, as it has become quite familiar in the use of the Lord's Prayer (in all American editions of the Common Prayer-Book). It is unwise to bring the language of the Church into conflict with the language of the school. But the English feeling will probably retain this and a number of other archaic forms; and concessions on such points should be readily made by the American revisers.

### 6. *Proper Names.*

To introduce uniformity in the spelling of proper names of persons and places, retaining, as a rule, the Hebrew forms for Hebrew names, the Greek forms for Greek, except where a foreign name has been thoroughly naturalized and unalterably fixed in English usage, as in the familiar names *Jesus* (the Saviour) for Joshua (the leader of Israel), *Mary* for Miriam, *James* for Jacob, *John* for Johannes, *Matthew* for Matthæus, *Andrew* for Andreas, *Paul* for Paulus, *Peter* for Petrus, *Stephen* for Stephanus, *Jerusalem* for Yerushalaim or Hierosolyma, *Athens*, *Rome*, and a few more.

(*a.*) HEBREW AND GREEK FORMS:

(1.) *Persons:*

Hagar (in the O. T.) and Agar (Gal. iv. 24, 25). Elijah (in the O. T.) and Elias (in the N.). Elisha and Eliseus. Isaiah, Esaias, and Esay. Jeremiah (in the O. T.) and Jeremias (Matt. xvi. 14), also Jeremy (twice in Matt. ii. 17; xvii. 9). Hosea and Osee (Rom. ix. 25). Jonah and Jonas. Obadiah and Abdias. Zechariah and Zacharias. Korah and Core (Jude 11). Noah (3 times in the N. T.) and Noe (5 times in the N. T.). Rahab and Rachab. Judah and Judas, also Jude. Joshua, and Jesus. The substitution of *Jesus* for *Joshua* in Acts vii. 45 ('brought in with *Jesus* into the possession of the Gentiles'), and in Heb. iv. 8 ('If *Jesus* had given them rest'), is especially mischievous, and should by all means be corrected.

(2.) *Places:*

Asshur and Assyria. Cush and Ethiopia. Phrat and Euphrates. Edom and Idumea. Koresh and Cyrus. Sodom (generally) and Sodoma (Rom. ix. 29).

(*b.*) Double Hebrew or Greek forms:

Balac and Balak. Enoch and Henoch. Enos and Enosh. Cainan and Kenan. Gedeon and Gideon. Jephthae and Jephthah. Judah and Juda. Jared and Jered. Jonah and Jona. Melchisedec and Melchizedek. Seth and Sheth.

Canaan and Kanaan. Gomorrha and Gomorrah. Sina (in Acts) and Sinai (Gal. iv. 24, 25).

(*c.*) Latin (or Hebrew, or Greek) and English terminations:

Lucas and Luke (Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24). Marcus (three times, Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24; 1 Pet. v. 13) and Mark (four times in Acts, and once in the Epp. 2 Tim. iv. 11). Judas and Jude. Timotheus and Timothy (even in the same chapter, 2 Cor. i. 1, 19). Jacob (*Ἰακώβ*, used of the patriarch) and James (*Ἰάκωβος*, of James the elder, James of Alpheus, and James the brother of the Lord). Jeremiah and Jeremy (retained in English names, as that of Bishop Jeremy Taylor). Miriam (of the sister of Moses) and Mary (to be retained for the mother of Jesus). Urbanus and Urbane (or Urban).

Grecia and Greece. Judæa and Jewry (the latter only in Dan. v. 13; John vii. 1; Luke xxiii. 5). Tyrus and Tyre. (Miletus, Acts xx. 15, 17, and Miletum, 2 Tim. iv. 20.) Cretes and Cretians (Cretans is better than either). Areopagus and Mars'-hill (in the same chapter, Acts xvii. 19, 22). Calvary and 'A place of a skull.'*

## 7. *Accessories.*

To revise the orthography, the punctuation, the use of capitals (as in *Spirit*, *Father*, *Son*, *Redeemer*, *Scriptures*, etc.), the words in italics, the marginal references, the chronology (of Usher), and the headings of chapters and columns, all in conformity with the style of translation, the most approved standards, and present scholarship and usage.

* Our *Calvary*, which is used only in Luke xxii. 33, for *κρανίον* (a diminutive of *κρᾶνον*), *a skull*, is derived from the Vulgate, which renders the Hebrew *Golgotha* by *calvaria* (fem. i. e. *skull*) in three other passages (Matt. xxvii. 33, Mark xv. 22, and John xix. 17). It is too deeply imbedded in Christian poetry and devotion to be given up. The popular expression '*Mount Calvary*' has no Scripture foundation, and is probably of monastic origin. The Evangelists describe Golgotha simply as *τόπος*,' a place,' or 'the Place of Skull.' It was probably only a small, round, and barren elevation in the shape of a skull, and derived its name from its globular form. See my textual notes in Lange, on *Matthew* xxvii. 33, p. 519 seq., and on *John* xix. 17, p. 582 seq.

These accessory matters, not being represented in the original text, belong to the boundary-line between translation and interpretation, and more freedom should be allowed here to the revisers than in the translation proper. The careful labors of the American Bible Society, as laid down in the edition of 1852, which was set aside again by a subsequent standard edition of 1860, more nearly conformed to the older editions, might be made available to good purpose.

### 8. *Arrangement.*

Finally, to combine with the received division into chapters and verses an arrangement of the prose in paragraphs, and a metrical arrangement of poetry, according to the laws of Hebrew parallelism.

The division into chapters, which dates from Cardinal Hugo de Santo Caro in the 13th century (d. 1263), and the division into verses,* first introduced in the Old Testament by Pagninus, in his edition of 1528, then completely by Robert Stephens, 1555, in his edition of the Vulgate, and 1551, in his (4th) edition of the Greek Testament, though very defective,† must, of course, for the sake of convenience, be retained, but should by all means be supplemented by a more reasonable and appropriate arrangement according to sections, stanzas, and verses. Much of the beauty of the Bible is lost to the common reader by the uniform printing of poetry and prose. If we have our hymn-books printed like poetry, why not also the inspired hymn-book, the Psalter?

This improvement, in which scholars and educated men are more interested than the mass of Bible readers, will probably be strenuously opposed; for since it strikes the eye, it would create the impression that the revised version is a different version from the familiar old Bible.‡ But this difficulty can

* Not to be confounded with the older *versus* or *στίχοι*.

† Thus the very first chapter of Genesis ought by all means to include the first three verses of the second chapter, which are an indispensable part of the first account of creation. The first chapter of Matthew ought to contain only the genealogy of Jesus till ver. 17, and the first chapter of John the Prologue to ver. 18. The versicular division which the learned printer Stephens (Etienne) is said to have made on a horseback journey (*inter equitandum*) from Paris to Lyons (see Bleek, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, p. 693), is entirely out of place in the narrative sections of the Bible, and very often breaks the connection. The judgment of Reuss, in his *Geschichte des Neuen Testaments* (p. 390, 4th ed.), is hardly too severe: '*Die Eintheilung (in Verse) ist an sich unsinnig, unzählige Male fehlerhaft und selbst im besten Falle entbehrlich für das Verständniss, das sie eher hindern als fördern kann.*' At the same time, for purposes of quotation, the division is very convenient, and has, no doubt, contributed much to the comparative study of the Bible. Compare on the whole subject Dr. William Wright, art. *Verse*, in Kitto's *Cycl. of Bibl. Lit.*, where numerous errors of preceding writers are corrected.

‡ The way is prepared, however, by several editions of the A.V. in this style, especially '*The Cambridge Paragraph Bible*,' edited by the Rev. F. H.

easily be removed by issuing two editions, one of which should be conformed to the usual Bibles, in which the paragraphs should be marked by signs.

The metrical arrangement should be carried out in the Psalms, the Book of Job (except the narrative prologue and epilogue), the Proverbs, the Song of Songs, Lamentations, and the poetic portions of the Prophets; also in the lyric and prophetic parts of the historical books, as the Song of Lamech (Gen. iv.), the Prediction of Noah (Gen. ix.), the Blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix.), the Song of Moses (Ex. xv.), the Prophecy of Balaam (Numb. xxiv.), the Song of Deborah (Judg. v.), the Elegy of David on Jonathan (2 Sam. i.); and as to the New Testament, in the Benedictus of Zachariah, the Magnificat of the Virgin Mary, the Parting Song of Simeon, the poetic citations scattered through the Gospels and Epistles (e. g. 1 Tim. iii. 16), and the anthems of the Apocalypse.

A few examples must suffice.

THE SONG OF LAMECH. Gen. iv. 23, 24.

This proud, defiant song of blood-revenge, or 'sword-song' (as Herder calls it), which commemorates the invention of weapons of brass and iron by Lamech's son Tubal-Cain, and the invention of musical instruments by his son Jubal (=Harper), and which marks the origin of worldly poetry and music among the descendants of Cain, has already all the characteristics of Hebrew poetry: parallelism, rhythm, and assonance.

'Adah and Zillah! hear my voice,
Ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech:
For a man have I slain* for wounding me,
Even a young man for hurting me.
Truly, Cain shall be avenged seven-fold,
But Lamech seventy-and-sevenfold.'

THE SONG OF THE VIRGIN MARY. Luke i. 46–55.

And Mary said:

46 My soul doth magnify the Lord,
47 And my Spirit rejoiced† in God my Saviour,
48 Because he looked upon the low estate of his handmaid.
For, behold, from henceforth all generations will call me blessed.

---

Scrivener, for the syndics of the University Press, Cambridge and London, 1870.

* The perfect, *I have slain* (הָרַגְתִּי, Sept. *ἀπέκτεινα*, Vulg. *occidi*), is probably used in the spirit of arrogant boasting, to express the future with all the certainty of an accomplished fact. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jerome, Rashi, set Lamech down as a murderer (of Cain), confessing his deed to ease his conscience; but Aben-Ezra, Calvin, Herder, Ewald, Delitzsch, take the verb as a threat: 'I will slay any man who wounds me.'

† I have throughout substituted the Greek aorists, *ἠγαλλίασεν*, *ἐπέβλεψεν*, *ἐποίησεν*, κ.τ.λ., for the perfects of the A.V.; but as the Magnificat is incorporated into the Anglican Liturgy, such changes will scarcely be made.

49 For the Mighty One did great things for me;
And holy is His name,
50 And His mercy is from generation to generation
Upon them that fear Him.

51 He wrought strength with his arm:
He scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts.
52 He put down princes from thrones,
And raised up them of low degree.

53 The hungry he filled with good things;
And the rich he sent away empty.
54 He gave help to Israel, His servant,
In remembrance of His mercy
55 (As he spake to our fathers)
To Abraham* and his seed forever.

## *Conclusion.*

In the preceding discussion I have barely touched upon the Old Testament, which would require a separate treatise. In some respects a revision of the English translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, especially the Book of Job and the Prophets, is even more needed than that of the Greek Testament. Shemitic scholarship is not so abundant in England and America as classical learning; but it is far more critical and accurate in the nineteenth century than it was in the sixteenth and seventeenth. Important additions to the Old Testament exegesis are now made almost every year. But if we are to wait for perfection, we shall have to wait forever. Let us make our work as perfect as we can, and let future generations make it still more perfect.

The revision must be chiefly a work of Biblical scholarship. But its success will depend by no means on scholarship alone. The most thorough knowledge of Hebrew and Greek would, after all, only enable us to understand the letter and the historical relations of the Scripture, but not

* Τῷ Ἀβραάμ must be connected with μνησθῆναι ἐλέους, not with ἐλάλησεν, as in the Authorized Version.

its soul, which lives in the body of the letter. The Bible is a divine as well as a human book, and reflects the theanthropic character of the incarnate Logos. To understand, to translate, and to interpret the Word of God, we must be in sympathy with its spirit, which is the Holy Spirit. Profound sympathy with the ideas of the Bible, religious enthusiasm, a reverent and devout spirit, breathe through the Vulgate, Luther's German, and the authorized English versions, and gave them such enduring power; and only the same qualities, united with superior scholarship, can commend the proposed revision to the acceptance of our Churches.

No. 40 Bible House, New York, October 4, 1872.

ON

# A FRESH REVISION

OF THE

# ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT.

BY

J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D.,
CANON OF ST. PAUL'S,
AND HULSEAN PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, CAMBRIDGE.

SECOND EDITION, REVISED.

NEW YORK:
HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS,
FRANKLIN SQUARE.
1873.

# PREFACE

## TO THE FIRST EDITION.

During the last summer, immediately before the Company appointed for the revision of the English New Testament held its first sitting, I was invited to read a paper on the subject before a clerical meeting. Finding that I had already written more than I could venture to read even to a very patient and considerate audience, and receiving a request from my hearers at the conclusion that the paper should be printed, I determined to revise the whole and make additions to it before publication. The result is the present volume. Owing to various interruptions, its appearance has been delayed much longer than I had anticipated.

This statement of facts was perhaps needed to justify the appearance of a book which, as occupying well-known ground, can not urge the plea of novelty, which has many imperfections in form, and which makes no pretensions to completeness. At all events, it appeared necessary to be thus explicit, in order to show that I alone am responsible for any expressions of opinion contained in this volume, and that they do not (except accidentally) represent the views of the Company of which I am a member. In preparing the original paper for the press, I have been careful not to go beyond verbal alterations where I was discussing the prospects of the new revision or the principles which in my opinion ought to guide it. On the other hand, I

have not scrupled to develop these principles freely, and to add fresh illustrations from time to time, but in most cases this has been done without any knowledge of the opinion of the majority of the Company; and in the comparatively few instances where this opinion has become known to me, I have expressed my own individual judgment, which might or might not accord therewith.

I ought to add, also, that I am quite prepared to find, on consultation with others, that some of the suggestions offered here are open to objections which I had overlooked, and which might render them impracticable in a version intended for popular use, whatever value they may have from a scholar's point of view.

The hopeful anticipations which I had ventured to express before the commencement of the work have been more than realized hitherto in its progress. On this point I have not heard a dissentient voice among members of the Company. I believe that all who have taken part regularly in the work will thankfully acknowledge the earnestness, moderation, truthfulness, and reverence which have marked the deliberations of the Company, and which seem to justify the most sanguine auguries.

This feeling contrasts strangely with the outcry which has been raised against the work by those who have had no opportunity of witnessing its actual progress, who have been disturbed by rumors of its results, either wholly false or only partially true, and who, necessarily judging on *à priori* grounds, have been ready to condemn it unheard. This panic was perhaps not unnatural, and might have been anticipated. Meanwhile, however, other dangers from an unforeseen quarter have threatened the progress of the revision, but these are now happily averted; and, so far as present appearances can be trusted, the momentary peril has resulted in permanent good, for the Company has been

taught by the danger which threatened it to feel its own strength and coherence, and there is every prospect that the work will be brought happily and successfully to a conclusion.

Great misunderstanding seems to prevail as to the ultimate reception of the work. The alarm which has been expressed in some quarters can only be explained by a vague confusion of thought, as though the Houses of Convocation, while solemnly pledged to the furtherance of the work on definite conditions, were also pledged to its ultimate reception whether good or bad. If the distinction had been kept in view, it is difficult to believe that there would have been even a momentary desire to repudiate the obligations of a definite contract. The Houses of Convocation are as free as the different bodies of Nonconformists represented in the Companies to reject the Revised Version, when it appears, if it is not satisfactory. I do not suppose that any member of either Company would think of claiming any other consideration for the work, when completed, than that it shall be judged by its intrinsic merits; but, on the other hand, they have a right to demand that it shall be laid before the Church and the people of England in its integrity, and that a verdict shall be pronounced upon it as a whole.

I can not close these remarks without expressing my deep thankfulness that I have been allowed to take part in this work of revision. I have spent many happy and profitable hours over it, and made many friends who otherwise would probably have remained unknown to me. Even though the work should be terminated abruptly to-morrow, I, for one, should not consider it lost labor.

In choosing my examples, I have generally avoided dwelling on passages which have been fully discussed by others; but it was not possible to put the case fairly before the

public without venturing from time to time on preoccupied ground, though in such instances I have endeavored to tread as lightly as possible.

The discussion in the Appendix perhaps needs some apology. Though it has apparently no very direct bearing on the main subject of the volume, yet the investigation was undertaken, in the first instance, with a view to my work as a reviser; and hoping that the results might contribute towards permanently fixing the meaning of an expression which occurs in the most familiar and most sacred of all forms of words, and which nevertheless has been and still is variously interpreted, I gladly seized this opportunity of placing them on record.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, *April* 3, 1871.

# PREFACE

## TO THE SECOND EDITION.

This second edition is in all essential respects a reprint of the first. A few errors have been corrected, and one or two unimportant additions made, but the new matter altogether would not occupy more than a page.

The reception accorded to this book has taken me by surprise, and the early call for a new edition would have prevented me from making any great changes, even if I had felt any desire to do so. To my critics, whether public or private, I can only return my very sincere thanks for their generous welcome of a work of whose imperfections the author himself must be only too conscious.

From this expression of gratitude I see no reason to except the critique of Mr. Earle in a letter addressed to the editor of the *Guardian;* but I am sure that he will pardon me if, while thankfully acknowledging the friendly tone of his letter, I venture entirely to dissent from a principle of translation to which he has lent the authority of his name.

In fact, he has attacked the very position in my work which I confidently held, and still hold, to be impregnable. I had laid it down as a rule (subject, of course, to special exceptions) that, where the same word occurs in the same context in the original, it should be rendered by the same equivalent in the version (p. 33 seq.); or, as Mr. Earle expresses it, that "a verbal repetition in English should be employed to represent a verbal repetition in the Greek."

Mr. Earle (I will employ his own words) would reverse this, and say that in many of my details he would practically come to my conclusion, but that the principle itself, with all the speciousness of its appearance, is essentially unsound. This position he endeavors to establish by arguments, which I feel bound to meet, for I consider the principle which he assails to be essential to a thoroughly good translation.

If, notwithstanding our opposite points of view, we had arrived at the same results, or, in other words, if Mr. Earle's exceptions to his principle of variety were coextensive or nearly coextensive with my own applications of my principle of uniformity, I should have felt any discussion of his views to be superfluous; for then, so far as regards any practical issues, the difference between us would have been reduced to a mere battle of words. But when I find that Mr. Earle defends such a rendering as Matt. xviii., 33, "Shouldest not thou also have had *compassion* (ἐλεῆσαι) on thy fellow-servant, even as I had *pity* (ἠλέησα) on thee?" I feel that the difference between us is irreconcilable. Indeed, I had vainly thought that my illustrations (with one or two doubtful exceptions) would carry conviction in themselves, and I confess myself a little surprised to find their cogency questioned by an English scholar of Mr. Earle's eminence.

But, lest I should be misunderstood, let me say at the outset that I entirely agree with Mr. Earle in deprecating the mode of procedure which would substitute "the fidelity of a lexicon" for "the faithfulness of a translation." I am well aware that this is a real danger to careful minds trained in habits of minute verbal criticism, and I always have raised and shall raise my voice against any changes which propose to sacrifice forcible English idiom to exact conformity of expression. For instance, it would be mere

pedantry to substitute "Do not ye rather excel them?" for "Are not ye much better than they?" in Matt. vi., 26 (*οὐχ ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε αὐτῶν*); or "The hour hath approached," for "The hour is at hand," in Matt. xxvi., 45 (*ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα*). But the point at issue seems to me to be wholly different. I can not for a moment regard this as a question of English idiom; and my objection to the variety of rendering which Mr. Earle advocates is that it does depart from "the faithfulness of a translation," and substitutes, not, indeed, the fidelity of a lexicon, but the caprice of a translator.

Mr. Earle says, "The stronghold of the Greek (I do not speak of Plato and Demosthenes, but of the New Testament) is in the words; the stronghold of the English language is in its phraseology and variability." This is not the distinction which I should myself give between the characteristics of the two languages. Even in its later stages, the wealth of particles, the power of inflection and composition, and the manifold possibilities of order, still constitute the peculiar superiority of the Greek over the English. But it matters little whether I am right or wrong here, for the objections to Mr. Earle's practical inferences are equally strong in either case. He first of all alleges examples where synonyms are coupled in English, and more especially in rendering from another language, as, for instance, in Chaucer's translation of Boethius's *De Consolatione Philosophiæ*, where *claritudo* is rendered "renoun and clernesse of linage," and *censor* "domesman or juge;" and he then urges that as this method of double rendering was "manifestly inadmissible in translating Scripture," "the translators fell upon a device by which they allowed some play to the natural bent of the English language; and where a Greek word occurs repeatedly in a context, they rather leaned to a variation of the rendering."

Now it is one thing to give a double rendering to a single word at any one occurrence, and another to give it two different renderings at two different occurrences in the same context. The two principles have nothing in common. In the former case the translation will at the worst be clumsy; in the latter it must in many cases be absolutely misleading; for by splitting up the sense of the word, and giving one half to one part of the sentence and the remaining half to the other, a disconnection, perhaps even a contrast, is introduced, which has no place in the original. If, therefore, the English on any occasion furnishes no exact and coextensive equivalent for a given Greek word as used in a given context (and this difficulty must occur again and again in translation from any language to another), it will generally be the less evil of the two to select the word which comes nearest in meaning to the original, and to retain this throughout.

But the examples of capricious varieties which I had chosen to illustrate this vicious principle of translation, and which Mr. Earle is prepared to defend, can not in most cases plead this justification, that a single English word does not adequately represent the Greek. It would require far more minute scholarship than I possess to discern any difference in meaning between *υἱός* and "son." Yet Mr. Earle stands forward as the champion of the rendering in Matt. xx., 20, "Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's *children* (*υἱῶν*) with her *sons* (*υἱῶν*)." The particular rendering is comparatively unimportant in itself, but as illustrating the capricious license of our translators it is highly significant. It introduces a variety for no reason at all; and this variety is incorrect in itself; for "the mother of Zebedee's children" is a wider expression than "the mother of Zebedee's sons," by which the evangelist intends only to describe her as the mother of James and John, with

whom the narrative is concerned, and which neither implies nor suggests the existence of other brothers and sisters.

Again, Mr. Earle is satisfied, and more than satisfied, with the rendering of Matt. xviii., 33, "Shouldest not thou also have had *compassion* (ἐλεῆσαι) on thy fellow-servant, even as I had *pity* (ἠλέησα) on thee?" "If," he asks, "we compare our 'compassion—pity,' with the one Greek word, what loss is there in the variation? Is there not a gain in breadth?" I answer, a very serious loss; and I do not allow that breadth (or, as I prefer to call it, looseness) is any gain where exact correspondence in the two clauses is essential to the main idea of the passage. What would be said if I were to suggest such translations as "Blessed are the *pitiful* (ἐλεήμονες), for they shall obtain *mercy* (ἐλεηθήσονται)," in Matt. v., 7, or "If ye *forgive* (ἀφῆτε) not men their *trespasses* (παραπτώματα), neither will your heavenly Father *remit* (ἀφήσει) your *transgressions* (παραπτώματα)," in Matt. vi., 15, or "Be ye therefore *faultless* (τέλειοι) as your Father which is in heaven is *perfect* (τέλειος)," in Matt. v., 48? I do not doubt that if these passages had been so translated in our Authorized Version, the variations would have found admirers; but as it is, who will question the vast superiority of the existing renderings, where the repetition of the English word corresponds to the repetition of the Greek? In all these passages the thought is one and the same, that the ideal of human conduct is the exact copying of the divine. In the other examples quoted our translators have preserved this thought unimpaired by repeating the same word, but in Matt. xviii., 33 it is marred by the double rendering "compassion, pity;" while the idea of "*fellow*-feeling," which is implied in "compassion," and in which the chief fault lies, has no place in the original ἐλεεῖν.

Again, Mr. Earle defends the double rendering of διαιρέσεις in 1 Cor. xii., 4, "There are *diversities* of gifts, but the

same Spirit; and there are *differences* of administrations, but the same Lord; and there are *diversities* of operations, but it is the same God, etc.," and seems even to regret the abandonment of Tyndale's triple rendering *diversities, differences, divers manners.* What again, I ask, would be said if I were to propose to translate 2 Cor. xi., 26, "In perils of waters, in dangers from robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in dangers from the heathen, in hazards in the city, in hazards in the wilderness, etc.," thus gaining breadth by varying the rendering of κινδύνοις? Happily, conservative feeling in this instance is enlisted on the right side, and it may be presumed that no change will be desired. But, so far as I can see, the two cases are exactly analogous; the effect of the sentence in each case depending on the maintenance of the same word, which arrests the ear, and produces its effect by repetition, like the tolling of a bell or the stroke on an anvil. Indeed, I must conclude that my mind is differently constituted from Mr. Earle's when I find him defending the translation of James ii., 2, 3, "If there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring in *goodly apparel* (ἐν ἐσθῆτι λαμπρᾷ), and there come in also a poor man in vile *raiment* (ἐσθῆτι), and ye have respect unto him that weareth the *gay clothing* (τὴν ἐσθῆτα τὴν λαμπράν), etc." Not only do I regard the variation here as highly artificial (a sufficient condemnation in itself), but it seems to me to *dissipate* the force of the passage, and therefore I am prepared to submit to the "cruel impoverishment" by which the English would be made to conform to the simplicity of the Greek. Nor again am I able to see why, in Rev. xvii., 6, ἐθαύμασα θαῦμα μέγα, "I *wondered* with great *admiration*," is to be preferred to the natural rendering, "I *wondered* with great *wonder*," as in 1 Thess. iii., 9, ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ χαρᾷ ᾗ χαίρομεν δι ὑμᾶς is translated "for all the *joy* wherewith we *joy* for your sakes,"

and not "for all the *gladness*." In this passage from the Revelation the words immediately following (ver. 7) run in the English Version, "And the angel said unto me, Wherefore didst thou *marvel* (ἐθαύμασας)?" where, by the introduction of a third rendering, a still further injury is inflicted on the compactness of the passage.

So far with regard to the sense. But Mr. Earle urges that the sound must be consulted; that the ear, for instance, requires the variations *compassion*, *pity*, in Matt. xviii., 33, and *wonder*, *admiration* (he omits to notice *marvel*) in Rev. xvii., 6, 7; that generally there is this "broad modulatory distinction between the ancient tongues and the great modern languages of Western Europe, that the former could tolerate reverberation to a degree which is intolerable to the latter;" and that "perhaps there is not one of them that is more sensitive in this respect than the English."

In reply to this, I will ask my readers whether there is any thing unpleasant to the ear in the frequent repetition of "perils" in the passage already quoted, 2 Cor. xi., 26, or of "blessed" in the beatitudes, Matt. v., 3–11. But this last reference suggests an application of the experimental test on a larger scale. I should find it difficult (and I venture to hope that Mr. Earle will agree with me here) to point to any three continuous chapters in the New Testament which are at once so vigorously and faithfully rendered, and in which the rhythm and sound so entirely satisfy the ear, as those which make up the Sermon on the Mount. Indeed, this portion of our Authorized Version deserves to be regarded as a very model of successful translation. What, then, are the facts? In the original the reverberation is sustained throughout, beginning with the beatitudes and ending with the closing parable, so that there are not many verses without an instance, while some contain two or three. Happily, in our Authorized Version, this characteristic is

faithfully reproduced. The temptation to capricious variety to which our translators elsewhere give way is here foregone; and, indeed, the whole number of the repetitions in the English is slightly greater than in the Greek; for though, either from inadvertence or from the exigencies of translation, one is dropped here and there (e.g., λάμπει, λαμψάτω, *giveth light, shine*, v., 15, 16; *bring, offer*, προσφέρῃς, πρόσφερε, v., 23, 24; ἀπολύσῃ, ἀπολελυμένην, *put away, divorced*, v., 31, 32; ἐπιορκήσεις, ὅρκους, *forswear, oaths*, v., 33; ἀφανίζουσι, φανῶσι, *disfigure, appear*, vi., 16; θησαυρίζετε, θησαυρούς, *lay up, treasures*, vi., 19; περιεβάλετο, περιβαλώμεθα, *arrayed, clothed*, vi., 29, 31; μέτρῳ, μετρεῖτε, *measure, mete* (?), vii., 2; ᾠκοδόμησεν, οἰκίαν, *built, house*, vii., 24), yet, on the other hand, the balance is more than redressed by the same rendering of different words in other parts (e.g., *light*, καίουσιν, λάμπει, φῶς, v., 14–16; *fulfill*, πληρῶσαι, γέγηται, v., 17, 18; *righteousness* repeated, though δικαιοσύνη occurs only once in the original, v., 20; *whosoever*, πᾶς ὁ, ὃς ἄν, v., 22; *divorcement, divorced*, ἀποστάσιον, ἀπολελυμένην, v., 31, 32; *forswear, swear*, ἐπιορκήσεις, ὀμόσαι, v., 33, 34; *reward*, μισθόν, ἀποδώσει, vi., 2, 4, 5, 6, 16, 18; *streets*, ῥύμαις, πλατειῶν, vi., 2, 5; *day, daily*, σήμερον, ἐπιούσιον, vi., 11; *light*, λύχνος, φωτεινόν, φῶς, vi., 22, 23; *raiment, arrayed*, ἐνδύματος, περιεβάλετο, vi., 28, 29; *clothe, clothed*, ἀμφιέννυσιν, περιβαλώμεθα, vi., 30, 31; *good*, ἀγαθόν, καλούς, vii., 17, 18; *beat*, προσέπεσαν, προσέκοψαν, vii., 25, 27). If my readers are of opinion that the general method adopted by our translators in the Sermon on the Mount is faulty, and that these three chapters would have gained by greater breadth and variety, I have nothing more to say; but if they are satisfied with this method, then they have conceded every thing for which I am arguing.*

* I confess myself quite unable to follow Mr. Earle's logic when he criticises what I had said of the Rheims Version. My words are (p. 44), "Of

But Mr. Earle proceeds: "There is no end to the curiosities of scholarship, and the perilous minutiæ that such a principle may lead to, if it is persevered in;" and by way of illustration he adds, "Dr. Lightfoot seems to ignore what I should have regarded as an obvious fact, that it is hardly possible in modern English to make a play upon words compatible with elevation of style. It was compatible with solemnity in Hebrew, and also in the Hebrew-tinctured Greek of the New Testament, but in English it is not. Explain it as you may, the fact is palpable. Does it not tax all our esteem for Shakspeare to put up with many a passage of which in any other author we should not hesitate to say that it was deformed and debased by a jingle of word-sounds?"

To this I answer fearlessly that I certainly do desire to see the play of words retained in the English Version, wherever it can be done without forcing the English. I believe that our translators acted rightly when they rendered χρώμενοι, καταχρώμενοι, by *use*, *abuse*, in 1 Cor. vii., 31; I believe that they were only wrong in translating κατατομή, περιτομή, *concision*, *circumcision*, in Phil. iii., 2, 3, because the former is hardly a recognized English word, and would not be generally understood. I freely confess that in many cases, perhaps in most cases, the thing can not

all the English versions, the Rhemish alone has paid attention to this point, and so far compares advantageously with the rest, to which, in most other respects, it is confessedly inferior." On this he remarks: "It is certainly unfortunate for our author's position that, by his own showing, the version which has kept to his principle should nevertheless be confessedly inferior in most other respects, including, as I apprehend, the highest respects that can affect our judgment of a version of Holy Scripture. To put this admission with the clearness due to its importance: the Rheims Version is the best in that it has observed our author's principle, but as a rendering of Scripture it is the worst." Why unfortunate? Does experience suggest that the man or the book that is right on five points out of six, must be right on the sixth point also? Does it not rather lead us to expect some element of right in the most wrong, and some element of wrong in the most right?

be done; but I am sorry for it.* I can not for a moment acquiesce in Mr. Earle's opinion that it is incompatible with "solemnity," with "elevation of style." Above all, I repudiate the notion, which seems to underlie whole paragraphs of Mr. Earle's critique, that it is the business of a translator, when he is dealing with the Bible, to *improve* the style of his author, having before my eyes the warning examples of the past, and believing that all such attempts will end in discomfiture.† Is it not one great merit of our English

* On my suggestion that in 2 Thess. iii., 11, the play on *ἐργαζομένους*, *περιεργαζομένους*, might be preserved by the words *business*, *busy-bodies*, Mr. Earle remarks: "As a matter of history, the word *business* has no radical connection with *busy:* it is merely a disguised form of the French *besognes.* This is, however, a secondary matter, because, if the word-play be desirable as a matter of English taste, these words would answer the purpose just as well as if their affinity were quite established." Without hazarding any opinion on a question on which Mr. Earle is so much more competent to speak than myself, I would venture to remark: (1.) That the direct derivation of *business* from *busy* is maintained by no less an authority than Jacob Grimm, *Deutsche Grammatik*, ii., p. 237 seq.; (2.) That other authorities maintain (whether rightly or wrongly I do not venture to say) the radical connection of the Teutonic words *busy* (Engl.), *bezig* (Dutch), with the Romance words *besogne*, *bisogna;* and (3.) That this very play of words occurs in the earliest English translations of the Scriptures, the Wicliffite Versions, in 1 Cor. vii., 32, "I wole you for to be withoute *bisynesse* (*ἀμερίμνους*, Vulg. *sine sollicitudine*). Sothli he that is withoute wyf is *bysy* (*μεριμνᾷ*, Vulg. *sollicitus est*) what thingis ben of the Lord."

Mr. Earle remarks that in 2 Thess. iii., 11, "Even the Rheims Version keeps clear of this (the play of words): it has 'working nothing, but curiously meddling.'" The fact is, that after its wont it has translated the Vulgate, "Nihil operantes sed curiose agentes," in which this characteristic of the original has disappeared.

This paronomasia is not confined to St. Paul, but occurs also in Aristides, ii., p. 418, *ταῦτα εἴργασται μέν . . . . περιείργασται δὲ μηδαμῶς*, just as the apostle's *φρονεῖν*, *σωφρονεῖν* (Rom. xii., 3) has a parallel in a passage quoted by Stobæus as from Charondas, *Floril.*, xliv., 40, *προσποιείσθω δὲ ἕκαστος τῶν πολιτῶν σωφρονεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ φρονεῖν.*

† The anxiety to impart dignity to the language of the apostles and evangelists reaches a climax in *A Liberal Translation of the New Testament, being an attempt to translate the Sacred Writings with the same Freedom, Spirit, and Elegance with which other English Translations from the Greek Classics have lately been executed:* by E. Harwood, London, 1768. In this strange production the following is a sample of St. Luke's narrative (xi., 40): "Absurd and preposterous conduct! Did not the Great Being, who made

Version, regarded as a literary work, that it has naturalized in our language the magnificent Hebraisms of the original? But the case before us is even stronger than this. The *paronomasia* is a characteristic of St. Paul's style, and should be reproduced (so far as the genius of the English language permits) like any other characteristic. That it is admissible, the example of Shakspeare which Mr. Earle adduces, and that of Tennyson, whose "name and fame" he himself has already quoted, and who abounds in similar examples of alliteration and assonance, not to mention other standard writers whether of the Elizabethan or of the Victorian era, are sufficient evidence. I am not concerned to defend Shakspeare's literary reputation, which may be left to itself; and I have certainly no wish to maintain that he was entirely free from the affectations of his age; but I am unfeignedly surprised to find plays on words condemned wholesale, as incompatible with elevation of style. Under

the external form, create the internal intellectual powers, and will he not be more solicitous for the purity of the mind than for the showy elegance of the body?" and this again of St. John's (iii., 32): "But though this exalted personage freely publishes and solemnly attests those heavenly doctrines, etc." The parable of the prodigal son in the former begins (xv., 11), "A gentleman of splendid family and opulent fortune had two sons." Even Dr. Johnson himself, the great master of grandiloquent English, could not tolerate this book. "Returning through the house," we are told, "he stepped into a small study or book-room. The first book he laid his hands upon was Harwood's *Liberal Translation of the New Testament.* The passage which first caught his eye was that sublime apostrophe in St. John upon the raising of Lazarus, *Jesus wept*, which Harwood had conceitedly rendered, *And Jesus, the Saviour of the world, burst into a flood of tears.* He contemptuously threw the book aside, exclaiming 'Puppy!'" (Appendix to Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, in Croker's edition, London, 1866, p. 836.) Johnson's biographer, Boswell, speaks of it as "a fantastical translation of the New Testament in modern phrase" (p. 506). See also Mr. Matthew Arnold's opinion (quoted below, p. 159) on a very similar attempt at a revised version by Franklin. I am quite sure that Mr. Earle's suffrage would be on the same side; but when he asks that the distinctive features of the sacred writers may be sacrificed to "elevation of style," and pleads that the language may be made more "full-bodied" to suit "the public taste" than it is in the original, is he not leading us, though by a different road, to the edge of the very same precipice?

certain circumstances, paronomasia, alliteration, and the like, are not only very natural, but, as indicating intensity of feeling, may produce even a tragic effect. With the appreciation of a great genius, Shakspeare himself has explained and justified their use under such circumstances. When John of Gaunt, in his last illness, is visited by Richard, and, in reply to the king's inquiry, keeps harping on his name,

"Old Gaunt indeed, and gaunt in being old,"

the king asks,

"Can sick men play so nicely with their names?"

The old man's answer is,

"No; *misery makes sport to mock itself.*"

The very intensity of his grief seeks relief in this way.*

Again, who will question the propriety of the play on words in Queen Elizabeth's outburst of anger against Gloucester after the murder of her children?

"Cousins, indeed; and by their uncle cozen'd
Of comfort, kingdom, kindred, freedom, life."

The very fierceness of her wrath seeks expression in the iteration of the same sounds.

And in cases where no intensity of passion exists, there may be some other determining motive. Thus we find a tendency in all languages to repetition of sound where a didactic purpose is served. Of this motive, the fondness for rhyme, alliteration, and the like, in the familiar proverbs of all languages, affords ample illustration, as in *Waste not, want not; Forewarned, forearmed; Man proposes, God disposes; Compendia dispendia;* παθήματα μαθήματα. To this category we may assign St. Paul's μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν (Rom. xii., 3). Indeed, it would not be difficult to show that in every

* Similarly Cicero, speaking of the Sicilians playing on the name of Verres, says (*Verr.*, Act ii., 1, 46), "etiam *ridiculi* inveniebantur *ex dolore*."

instance the apostle had some reason for employing this figure, and that he did not use it as a mere rhetorical plaything. We may find ourselves unable, in any individual case, to reproduce the same effect in English, and thus may be forced to abandon the attempt in despair; but not the less earnestly shall we protest against the principle that the genius of our language requires us to abstain from the attempt under any circumstances, and that a form of speech which is natural in itself and common to all languages must be sacrificed to some fancied ideal of an elevated style.

TRINITY COLLEGE, *St. John's Day*, 1871.

# CONTENTS.


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | St. Jerome's Revision of the Latin Bible | 23 |
| II. | Authorized Version of the English Bible | 29 |
| III. | Lessons suggested by these Historical Parallels | 31 |
| IV. | Necessity for a fresh Revision of the Authorized Version | 34 |
| | § 1. False Readings | 36 |
| | § 2. Artificial distinctions created | 46 |
| | § 3. Real distinctions obliterated | 65 |
| | § 4. Faults of Grammar | 80 |
| | § 5. Faults of Lexicography | 118 |
| | § 6. Treatment of Proper Names, Official Titles, etc. | 127 |
| | § 7. Archaisms, Defects in the English, Errors of the Press, etc. | 144 |
| V. | Prospects of the New Revision | 157 |
| Appendix on the words *ἐπιούσιος, περιούσιος* | | 163 |
| Indices | | 185 |

# A FRESH REVISION

OF THE

# ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT.

---

## I.

More than two centuries had elapsed since the first Latin Version of the Scriptures was made, when the variations and errors of the Latin Bible began to attract the attention of students and to call for revision. It happened providentially that, at the very moment when the need was felt, the right man was forthcoming. In the first fifteen centuries of her existence the Western Church produced no Biblical scholar who could compare with St. Jerome in competence for so great a task. At the suggestion of his ecclesiastical superior, Damasus, bishop of Rome, he undertook this work, for which many years of self-denying labor had eminently fitted him.

It is no part of my design to give a detailed account of this undertaking. I wish only to remark, that when Jerome applied himself to his task, he foresaw that he should expose himself to violent attacks, and that this anticipation was not disappointed by the result. "Who," he asks, in his Preface to the Gospels, the first portion of the work which he completed, "who, whether learned or unlearned, when he takes up the volume, and finds that what he reads differs from the flavor he has once tasted, will not immediately raise his voice and pronounce me guilty of forgery and sacrilege for daring to add, to change, to correct any thing in the ancient books?"*

* *Op.*, x., 660 (ed. Vallarsi).

Again and again he defends himself against his antagonists. His temper, naturally irritable, was provoked beyond measure by these undeserved attacks, and betrayed him into language which I shall not attempt to defend. Thus writing to Marcella,* he mentions certain "poor creatures (homunculos) who studiously calumniate him for attempting to correct some passages in the Gospels against the authority of the ancients and the opinion of the whole world." "I could afford to despise them," he says, "if I stood upon my rights, for a lyre is played in vain to an ass." "If they do not like the water from the purest fountain-head, let them drink of the muddy streams." And after more to the same effect, he returns again at the close of the letter to these "two-legged donkeys (bipedes asellos)," exclaiming, "Let *them* read, *Rejoicing in hope, serving the time;* let *us* read, *Rejoicing in hope, serving the Lord;*† let *them* consider that an accusation ought under no circumstances to be received against an elder; let *us* read, *Against an elder receive not an accusation but before two or three witnesses; them that sin rebuke.*‡ Let *them* be satisfied with, *It is a human saying, and worthy of all acceptation;* let *us* err with the Greeks, that is, with the apostle who spoke in Greek, *It is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation.*"§ And elsewhere, referring to these same detractors, he writes, with a severity which was not undeserved, "Let them read first and despise afterward, lest they appear to condemn works of which they know nothing, not from deliberate judgment, but from the prejudice of hatred."‖ "Thus much I say in reply to my traducers, who snap at me like dogs, maligning me in public and reading me in a corner, at once my accusers and my defenders, seeing that they approve in others what they disapprove in me."¶

If these attacks had been confined to personal enemies like

* *Epist.*, 28 (i., p. 133). † The reading καιρῷ for κυρίῳ, Rom. xii., 11.
‡ The omission of the clause εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων, 1 Tim. v., 19.
§ The reading ἀνθρώπινος for πιστός, 1 Tim. iii., 1.
‖ *Op.*, ix., 684. ¶ *Op.*, ix., 1408.

Rufinus,* who were only retaliating upon Jerome the harsh treatment which they had received at his hands, his complaints would not have excited much sympathy. But even friends looked coldly or suspiciously on his noble work. His admirer, the great Augustine himself, wrote to deprecate an undertaking which might be followed by such serious results. He illustrated his fears by reference to the well-known incident to which Jerome's version of the Book of Jonah had given occasion, as a sample of the consequences that might be expected to ensue. A certain bishop had nearly lost his flock by venturing to substitute Jerome's rendering "hedera" for "cucurbita," and could only win them back again by reinstating the old version which he had abandoned. They would not tolerate a change in an expression "which had been fixed by time in the feelings and memory of all, and had been repeated through so many ages in succession."†

Of the changes which Jerome introduced into the text of the New Testament, the passage quoted above affords sufficient illustration. In the Old Testament a more arduous task awaited him. The Latin Version which his labors were destined to supersede had been made from the Septuagint. He himself undertook to revise the text in conformity with the original Hebrew. It will appear strange to our own age that this was the chief ground of accusation against him. All the Greek and Latin churches, it was urged, had hitherto used one and the same Bible; but this bond of union would be dissolved by a new version made from a different text. Thus the utmost confusion would ensue. Moreover, what injury might not be done to the faith of the weaker brethren by casting doubt on the state of the sacred text? What wounds might not be inflicted on the pious sentiments of the believer by laying sacrilegious hands on language hallowed by long time and association?

* See Hieron., *Op.*, ii., 660, where Rufinus exclaims, "Istud commissum dic quomodo emendabitur? immo, nefas quomodo expiabitur?" with more to the same effect.

† Hieron., *Epist.*, 104 (i., 636 seq.).

But, independently of the dangerous consequences which might be expected, no words were too strong to condemn the arrogance and presumption of one who thus ventured to set aside the sacred text as it had been used by all branches and in all ages of the Church from the beginning. To this cruel taunt Jerome replied nobly: "I do not condemn, I do not blame the Seventy, but I confidently prefer the apostles to them all."* "I beseech you, reader, do not regard my labors as throwing blame on the ancients. Each man offers what he can for the tabernacle of God.† Some, gold, and silver, and precious stones; others, fine linen, and purple, and scarlet, and blue: I shall hold myself happy if I have offered skins and goats' hair. And yet the apostle considers that the more despised members are more necessary (1 Cor. xii., 22)."‡

Moreover, there was a very exaggerated estimate of the amount of change which his revision would introduce. Thus Augustine, when endeavoring to deter him, speaks of his new *translation;* Jerome, in reply, tacitly corrects his illustrious correspondent, and calls the work a *revision.*§ And throughout he holds the same guarded language: he protests that he has no desire to introduce change for the mere sake of change, and that only such alterations will be made as strict fidelity to the original demands. His object is solely to place the *Hebraica veritas* before his readers in the vernacular tongue, and to this object he is steadfast.

In executing this great work, Jerome was in constant communication with Jewish rabbis, who were his Hebrew teachers, and to whom he was much indebted in many ways. How great a gain this assistance was to his revision, and how largely after ages have profited by the knowledge thus brought to bear on the sacred text, I need hardly say. We may suspect (though no direct notice on this point is preserved) that with

* *Op.*, ix., 6. † Exod. xxv., 2 seq. ‡ *Op.*, ix., 460.

§ See Hieron., *Epist.*, 104, i., 637, for Augustine's letter ("Evangelium ex Græco interpretatus es"), and *Epist.*, 112, i., 753, for Jerome's reply ("in Novi Testamenti emendatione"). See Dr. Westcott, in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, s.v. *Vulgate*, ii., p. 1696.

his contemporaries this fact was prominent among the counts of the indictment against him. At least it is certain that they set their faces against his substitution of the Hebrew text for the Septuagint Version on the ground that the former had been tampered with by the malignity and obduracy of the Jews. But, if this suspicion wrongs them, and they did not object to his availing himself of such extraneous aid, then they evinced greater liberality than has always been shown by the opponents of revision in later years.

Happily Jerome felt strong in the power of truth, and could resist alike the importunity of friends and the assaults of foes. His sole object was to place before the Latin-speaking churches the most faithful representation of the actual words of the sacred text, and the consciousness of this great purpose nerved him with a strength beyond himself. The character of this father will not kindle any deep affection or respect. We are repelled by his coarseness and want of refinement, by his asperity of temper, by his vanity and self-assertion. We look in vain for that transparent simplicity which is the true foundation of the highest saintliness. But in this instance the nobler instincts of the Biblical scholar triumphed over the baser passions of the man; and in his lifelong devotion to this one object of placing the Bible in its integrity before the Western Church, his character rises to true sublimity. "I beseech you," he writes, "pour out your prayers to the Lord for me, that so long as I am in this poor body I may write something acceptable to you, useful to the Church, and worthy of after ages. Indeed, I am not moved overmuch by the judgments of living men: they err on the one side or on the other through affection or through hatred."* "My voice," he says elsewhere, "shall never be silent, Christ helping me. Though my tongue be cut off, it shall still stammer. Let those read who will; let those who will not, reject."† And, inspired with a true scholar's sense of the dignity of conscientious work for its own sake, irrespective of any striking

* *Op.*, ix., 1364. † Id. ib., 1526.

results, after mentioning the pains which it has cost him to unravel the entanglement of names in the Books of Chronicles, he recalls a famous word of encouragement addressed of old by Antigenidas the flute-player to his pupil Ismenias, whose skill had failed to catch the popular fancy: "Play to me and to the Muses." So Jerome describes his own set purpose: "Like Ismenias, I play to myself and to mine, if the ears of the rest are deaf."*

Thus far I have dwelt on the opposition which Jerome encountered on all hands, and the dauntless resolution with which he accomplished his task. Let me now say a few words on the subsequent fate of his revision, for this also is an instructive page in history.† When completed, it received no authoritative sanction. His patron, pope Damasus, at whose instigation he had undertaken the task, was dead. The successors of Damasus showed no favor to Jerome or to his work. The Old Latin still continued to be read in churches: it was still quoted in the writings of divines. Even Augustine, who, after the completion of the task, seems to have overcome his misgivings, and speaks in praise of Jerome's work, remains constant to the older version. But first one writer, and then another, begins to adopt the revised translation of Jerome. Still its recognition depends on the caprice or the judgment of individual men. Even the bishops of Rome had not yet discovered that it was "authentic." One pope will use the Hieronymian revision; a second will retain the Old Latin; while a third will use either indifferently, and a fourth will quote from the one in the Old Testament and from the other in the New.‡ As late as two centuries after Jerome's time, Gregory the Great can still write that he intends to avail himself of either indifferently, as his purpose may require, since "the Apostolic See, over which, by the

* *Op.*, ix., 1408, "Mihimet ipsi et meis juxta Ismeniam canens, si aures surdæ sunt ceterorum."

† The history of the gradual reception of Jerome's revision is traced in Kaulen's *Geschichte der Vulgata*, p. 190 seq. (Mainz, 1868).

‡ These statements may be verified by the quotations in Kaulen's work.

grace of God, he presides, uses both."* Thus slowly, but surely, Jerome's revision won its way, till at length, some centuries after its author's death, it drove its elder rivals out of the field, and became the one recognized version of the Bible throughout the Latin churches.

## II.

I can not forbear to call attention in passing to the close parallel which these facts present to the history of the so-called Authorized Version. This too, like Jerome's revision, was undertaken amid many misgivings, and, when it appeared, was received with coldness or criticised with severity. When the proposal for a revision was first brought forward, "my Lord of London" is reported to have said that "if every man's humor should be followed there would be no end of translating." The translators themselves, when they issue their work to the public, deprecate the adverse criticism which doubtless they saw very good reason to apprehend. Such a work as theirs, they say in the opening paragraph of the Preface to the Reader, "is welcomed with suspicion instead of love, and with emulation instead of thanks; . . . and if there be any hole left for cavil to enter (and cavil, if it do not find a hole, will make one), it is sure to be misconstrued, and in danger to be condemned. This will easily be granted by as many as know story or have any experience. For was there ever any thing projected that savored any way of newness or renewing but the same endured many a storm of gainsaying or opposition?" and again: "Whosoever attempteth any thing for the public (especially if it pertain to religion, and to the opening and clearing of the Word of God), the same setteth himself upon a stage to be glouted

* Greg. Magn., *Mor. in Iob.*, Epist. ad fin. "Novam translationem dissero; sed cum probationis causa exigit, nunc novam, nunc veterem per testimonia assumo; ut, quia sedes Apostolica cui Deo auctore præsideo utraque utitur, mei quoque labor studii ex utraque fulciatur" (*Op.*, i., p. 6, Venet., 1768).

upon by every evil eye, yea, he casteth himself headlong upon pikes, to be gored by every sharp tongue. For he that meddleth with men's religion in any part, meddleth with their custom, nay, with their freehold; and though they find no content in that which they have, yet they can not abide to hear of altering."

The parallel, moreover, extends to the circumstances of its reception. It seems now to be an established fact (so far as any fact in history which involves a comprehensive negative can be regarded as established) that the Revised Version never received any final authorization either from the ecclesiastical or from the civil powers; that it was not sanctioned either by the Houses of Parliament, or by the Houses of Convocation, or by the king in council. The Bishops' Bible still continued to be read in churches; the Geneva Bible was still the familiar volume of the fireside and closet.* Several years after the appearance of the Revised Version, Bishop Andrewes, though himself one of the revisers, still continues to quote from an older Bible. Yet, notwithstanding all adverse circumstances, it overpowered both its rivals by the force of superior merit. It was found to be, as one had said long before of Jerome's revision, "et verborum tenacior et perspicuitate sententiæ clarior;"† and this was the secret of its success. "Thus," writes Dr. Westcott, "at the very time when the monarchy and the Church were, as it seemed, finally overthrown, the English people, by their silent and unanimous acceptance of the new Bible, gave a spontaneous testi-

* The printing of the Bishops' Bible was stopped as soon as the new revision was determined upon. The last edition of the former was published in 1606. The Revised Version states on its title-page (1611) that it is "Appointed to be read in Churches," but we are not told by whom or how it was appointed. As the copies of the Bishops' Bible used in the churches were worn out, they would probably be replaced by the Revised Version; but this seems to have been the only advantage which was accorded to it. On the other hand, the Geneva Bible continued to be printed by the king's printer some years after the appearance of the Revised Version, and was still marked "Cum privilegio Regiæ majestatis."

† Isidor. Hispal., *Etym.*, vi., 4; comp. *De Off. Eccl.*, i., 12.

mony to the principles of order and catholicity of which both were an embodiment." "A revision which embodied the ripe fruit of nearly a century of labor, and appealed to the religious instinct of a great Christian people, gained by its own internal character a vital authority which could never have been secured by any edict of sovereign rulers."*

But the parallel may be carried a step farther. In both these cases alike, as we have seen, God's law of progressive improvement, which in animal and vegetable life has been called the principle of natural selection, was vindicated here, so that the inferior gradually disappeared before the superior in the same kind; but in both cases also the remnants of an earlier Bible held and still hold their ground, as a testimony to the past. As in parts of the Latin Service-books the Vulgate has not even yet displaced the Old Latin, which is still retained either in its pristine or in its partially amended form, so also in our own Book of Common Prayer an older version still maintains its place in the Psalter and in the occasional sentences, as if to keep before our eyes the progressive history of our English Bible.

## III.

All history is a type, a parable. The hopes and the misgivings, the failures and the successes of the past reproduce themselves in the present; and it appeared to me that at this crisis, when a revision of our English Bible is imminent, we might with advantage study the history of that revised translation, which alone among Biblical Versions can bear comparison with our own in its circulation and influence.

And, first of all, in the gloomy forebodings which have ushered in this scheme for a new revision, we seem to hear the very echo of those warning voices, which happily fell dead on the ear of the resolute Jerome. The alarming consequences which some anticipate from any attempt to meddle with our

* *History of the English Bible*, p. 158, 160.

time-honored version have their exact counterpart in the apprehensions by which his contemporaries sought to deter him. The danger of estranging divers churches and congregations at present united in the acceptance of a common Bible, and the danger of perplexing the faith of individual believers by suggesting to them variations of text and uncertainties of interpretation—these are now, as they were then, the twin perils by which it is sought to scare the advocates of revision.

Moreover, there is the like exaggerated estimate of the amount of change which any body of revisers would probably introduce. To this we can only give the same answer as Jerome. Not translation, but revision, is the object of all who have promoted this new movement. There is no intention of snapping the thread of history by the introduction of a new version. Our English Bible owes its unrivaled merits to the principle of revision, and this principle it is proposed once more to invoke. "To whom ever," say the authors of our Received Version, "was it imputed for a failing (by such as were wise) to go over that which he had done, and to amend it where he saw cause?" "Truly, good Christian reader, we never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make a bad one a good one . . . but to make a good one better . . . that hath been our endeavor, that our mark."

Nor again will the eminence of antagonists deter the promoters of this movement, if they feel that they have truth on their side. Augustine was a greater theologian, as well as a better man, than Jerome. But in this matter he was treading on alien ground; he had not earned the right to speak. On the other hand, a life-long devotion to the study of the Biblical text in the original languages had filled Jerome with the sense alike of the importance of the work and of the responsibility of his position. He could not be deterred by the fears of any adversaries, however good and however able. He felt the iron hand of a strong necessity laid upon him, and he

could not choose but open out to others the stores of scriptural wealth which he himself had been permitted to amass.

And again, we may take courage from the results which followed from his design, dauntlessly and persistently carried out. None of the perilous consequences which friend and foe alike had foreboded did really ensue. There was, indeed, a long interval of transition, during which the rival versions contended for supremacy; but no weakening of individual faith, no alienation of churches, can be traced to this source. The great schism of the Church, the severance of East and West, was due to human passion and prejudice, to fraud, and self-will, and ambition. History does not mention any relaxation of the bonds of union as the consequence of Jerome's work. On the contrary, the Vulgate has been a tower of strength to the Latin churches, as Jerome foresaw that it would be. He labored for conscience sake, more than content if his work proved acceptable to one or two intimate friends; he sought not the praise of men; his own generation viewed his labors with suspicion or hatred, and he has been rewarded with the universal gratitude of after ages.

Nor is it uninstructive to observe that the very point on which his contemporaries laid the greatest stress in their charges against him has come to be regarded by ourselves as his most signal merit. To him we owe it that in the Western churches the Hebrew original, and not the Septuagint Version, is the basis of the people's Bible; and that a broad and indelible line has been drawn once for all between the canon of the Old Testament as known to the Hebrew nation, and the later accretions which had gathered about it in the Greek and Latin Bibles. Thus we are reaping the fruits of his courage and fidelity. We are the proper heirs of his labors. The Articles of the Church of England still continue to quote St. Jerome's authority for the distinction between the canonical and apocryphal books, which the Council of Trent did its best to obscure.

But there is yet another lesson to be learned from the his-

tory of Jerome's revision. The circumstances of its reception are full of instruction and encouragement. It owed nothing, as we have seen, to official sanction; it won its way by sterling merit. Now let us suppose that the revision which we are about to undertake is successfully accomplished. How are we to deal with it? If the work commends itself at once to all or to a large majority as superior to the present version, then let it by all means be substituted by some formal authorization. But this is quite too much to expect. Though St. Jerome's revision was incomparably better than the Old Latin, though the superiority of our received English version to its predecessors is allowed on all hands, no such instantaneous welcome was accorded to either. They had to run the gauntlet of adverse criticism; they fought their way to acceptance inch by inch. I suppose that no one who takes part in this new revision is so sanguine as to hope that his work will be more tenderly treated. This being so, it does not seem to be necessary, and it is perhaps not even advisable, that the new Revised Version, if successfully completed, should at once authoritatively displace the old. Only let it not be prohibited. Give it a fair field, and a few years will decide the question of superiority. I do not myself consider it a great evil that for a time two concurrent versions should be in use. This, at least, seems a simple practical solution, unless, indeed, there should be such an immediate convergence of opinion in favor of the revised version as past experience does not encourage us to expect.

## IV.

But let it be granted that the spectres which a timid apprehension calls into being are scared away by the light of history and experience, and that the dangerous consequences of revision are shown to be imaginary; we have still to ask whether there is sufficient reason for undertaking such a work, or (in other words) whether the defects of the existing

version are such as to call for systematic amendment? Here again we are met by the same objection, of which our translators were obliged to take notice: "Many men's mouths," they write, "have been open a good while (and yet are not stopped) with speeches about the translation so long in hand . . . and ask what may be the reason, what the necessity of the employment: Hath the Church been deceived, say they, all this while? Hath her sweet bread been mingled with leaven, her silver with dross, her wine with water, her milk with lime?"

In addressing myself to this question, I can not attempt to give an exhaustive answer. Materials for such an answer will be found scattered up and down Biblical Commentaries and other exegetical works.* In Archbishop Trench's instructive volume *On the Authorized Version* of the New Testament, published a few years ago, they are gathered into a focus; and quite recently, in anticipation of the impending revision, Bishop Ellicott has stated the case concisely, giving examples of different classes of errors which call for correction. For a fuller justification of the advocates of revision I would refer to these and similar works, confining myself to a few more prominent points, in which our version falls behind the knowledge of the age, and offering some examples in illustration of each. While doing so, I shall be led necessarily to dwell almost exclusively on the defects of our English Bible, and to ignore its merits. But I trust it will be unnecessary for me, on this account, to deprecate adverse criticism. No misapprehension is more serious or more unjust than the assumption that those who advocate revision are blind to the excellence of the existing version. It is the very sense of this excellence which prompts the desire to make an admirable instrument more perfect. On the other hand, they can not shut their eyes to the fact that the assiduous labors of scholars and divines during two centuries and a half have

* For the literature of the subject, see Professor Plumptre's interesting article in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, s.v. *Version, Authorized*, p. 1679.

not been fruitless, and they are naturally anxious to pour into the treasury of the temple these accumulated gains of many generations.

§ 1.

And first of all let us boldly face the fact that the most important changes in which a revision may result will be due to the variations of reading in the Greek text. It was not the fault, it was the misfortune, of the scholars from Tyndale downward, to whom we owe our English Bible, that the only text accessible to them was faulty and corrupt. I need not take up time in recapitulating the history of the received text, which will be known to all. It is sufficient to state that all textual critics are substantially agreed on this point, though they may differ among themselves as to the exact amount of change which it will be necessary to introduce.

No doubt, when the subject of various readings is mentioned, grave apprehensions will arise in the minds of some persons. But this is just the case where more light is wanted to allay the fears which a vague imagination excites. The recent language of alarmists on this point seems incredible to those who have paid any attention to the subject. I can only state my own conviction that a study of the history and condition of the Greek text solves far more difficulties than it creates. More especially it brings out the fact of the very early and wide diffusion of the New Testament writings with a clearness and a cogency which is irresistible, and thus bears most important testimony to their genuineness and integrity. Even the variations themselves have the highest value in this respect. Thus, for instance, when we find that soon after the middle of the second century divergent readings of a striking kind occur in St. John's Gospel, as, for instance, *μονογενὴς* Θεὸς and *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός* (i., 18), we are led to the conclusion that the text has already a history, and that the Gospel, therefore, can not have been very recent. This evidential value of textual criticism, moreover, shows itself

in other ways. I will select one instance, which has always appeared to me very instructive, as illustrating the results of this study—apparently so revolutionary in its methods, and yet really so conservative in its ends.

The Epistle to the Ephesians, after having been received by churches and individuals alike (so far as we know), without a single exception, from the earliest times, as the unquestioned work of the apostle whose name it bears, has been challenged in our own generation. Now there is one formidable argument, and one only, against its genuineness. It is urged with irresistible force that St. Paul could not have written in this strain to a Church in which he had resided for some three years, and with which he lived on the closest and most affectionate terms. So far as regards reference to persons or incidents, this is quite the most colorless of all St. Paul's Epistles; whereas we should expect to find it more full and definite in its allusions than any other, except perhaps the letters to Corinth. To this objection no satisfactory answer can be given without the aid of textual criticism. But from textual criticism we learn that an intelligent and well-informed, though heretical writer of the second century, called it an Epistle to the Laodiceans; that in the opening verse the words "in Ephesus" are wanting in the two oldest extant Greek MSS.; that the most learned of the Greek fathers in the middle of the third century—himself a textual critic—had not the words in his copy or copies; and that another learned Greek father in the middle of the fourth century declares them to be absent from the oldest manuscripts—not to mention other subsidiary notices tending in the same direction. Putting these facts together, we get a complete answer to the objection. The epistle is found to be a circular letter, addressed probably to the churches of Proconsular Asia, of which Ephesus was one and Laodicea another. From Ephesus, as the metropolis, it derived its usual title, because the largest number of copies in circulation would be derived from the autograph sent thither; but

here and there a copy was extant in early times addressed to some other Church (as Laodicea, for instance); and still more commonly copies existed taken from some MS. in which the blank for the name of the Church had not been filled up. This circular character of the letter fully explains the absence of personal or historical allusions. Thus textual criticism in this instance removes our difficulty; but its services do not end here. It furnishes a body of circumstantial evidence which, I venture to think, must ultimately carry irresistible conviction as to the authorship of the letter, though for the present some are found to hesitate. For these facts supplied by textual criticism connect themselves with the mention of the letter which the Colossians are charged to get from Laodicea (Col. iv.,16), and this mention again combines with the strong resemblances of matter and diction, so as to bind these two epistles inseparably together, while, again, the Epistle to the Colossians is linked not less indissolubly with the letter to Philemon by the references to person, and place, and circumstance. Thus the three epistles form a compact whole, to resist the assaults of adverse criticism. A striking amount of undesigned coincidence is gathered together from the most diverse quarters, converging unmistakably to one result. And the point to be observed is, that many of these coincident elements are not found in the epistles themselves, but in the external history of the text, a circumstance which gives them a far higher evidential value. For, even if it were possible to imagine a forger in an uncritical age at once able to devise a series of artifices so subtle and so complex as on the supposition of the spuriousness of one or all of these letters we are obliged to assume, and willing to defeat his own purpose by tangling a skein which it would require the critical education of the nineteenth century to unravel, yet there would remain the still greater improbability that a man in such a position could have exercised an effective control over external circumstances—the diffusion and the subsequent history of his forgeries—such as this hypothesis would suppose.

This instance will illustrate my meaning when I alluded to the conservative action of textual criticism, for such I conceive to be its general tendency. But, in fact, the consideration of consequences ought not to weigh with us in a matter where duty is so obvious. It must be our single aim to place the Bible in its integrity before the people of Christ; and, so long as we sincerely follow the truth, we can afford to leave the consequences in God's hands; and I can not too strongly urge the truism (for truism it is) that the higher value we set on the Bible as being or as containing the Word of God, the greater (if we are faithful to our trust) will be our care to ascertain the exact expressions of the original by the aid of all the critical resources at our command. We have seen that St. Jerome's courage was chiefly tried in the substitution of a purer text, and that his fidelity herein has been recognized as his greatest claim to the gratitude of after ages. The work which our new revisers will be required to execute is far less revolutionary than his. Where his task required him to substitute a wholly new text in the Old Testament, they will only be required to cancel or to change a word or expression, or, in rare cases, a verse, here and there in the New. Where he was faithful in great things, we may trust that they will not be faithless in small.

The question, therefore, is not one of policy, but of truth. Yet still it is well to face the probable results, because apprehension is especially alive on this point, and because only by boldly confronting the spectres of a vague alarm can we hope to lay them.

Let us, then, first of all, set it down as an unmixed gain that we shall rid ourselves of an alliance which is a constant source of weakness and perplexity to us. No more serious damage can be done to a true cause than by summoning in its defense a witness who is justly suspected or manifestly perjured. Yet this is exactly the attitude which the verse relating to the heavenly witnesses (1 John v., 7) bears towards the great doctrine which it proclaims, so long as it retains a

place in the Bible which we put into the hands of the people. Shortly after the question of revision was first mooted, an article on the subject appeared in a popular daily paper, in which the writer, taking occasion to refer to this verse, committed himself to two statements respecting it: *first*, that the passage in question had done much towards promoting the belief in the doctrine which it puts forward; and, *secondly*, that the interpolator knew well what he was about, and used very efficient means to gain his end. Now both these statements were evidently made in good faith by the writer, and would, I suppose, be accepted as true by a very large number of his readers. But those who have given any special attention to the subject know that neither will bear examination. The first contradicts the plain facts of history; the second militates against the most probable inferences of criticism. As regards the first point, it seems unquestionable that the doctrine was formally defined and firmly established some time before the interpolation appeared. A study of history shows that the Church arrived at the catholic statement of the doctrine of the Trinity partly because it was indicated in other passages of the New Testament (*e.g.*, Matt. xxviii., 19; 2 Cor. xiii., 14), and partly because it was the only statement which, recognizing the fact of the Incarnation of the Divine Word, was found at once to satisfy the instincts of a devout belief and the requirements of a true philosophy; and that the text in question had not, and could not have, any thing to do with its establishment. Indeed, the very fact that it is nowhere quoted by the great controversial writers of the fourth and fifth centuries has been truly regarded as the strongest evidence against its genuineness. And in more recent times, when the doctrine began to be challenged, the text was challenged also; so that at this stage the doctrine did not gain, but lose, by the advocacy of a witness whose questionable character threw discredit upon it. Again, the second statement equally breaks down when investigated. Textual criticism shows that the clause contain-

ing the three heavenly witnesses was not, in the first instance, a deliberate forgery, but a comparatively innocent gloss, which put a directly theological interpretation on the three genuine witnesses of St. John—the spirit, and the water, and the blood—a gloss which is given substantially by St. Augustine, and was indicated before by Origen and Cyprian, and which first thrust itself into the text in some Latin MSS., where it betrays its origin not only by its varieties of form, but also by the fact that it occurs sometimes before and sometimes after the mention of the three genuine witnesses which it was intended to explain. Thus both these statements alike break down, and we see no ground for placing this memorable verse in the same category with such fictions as the False Decretals, whether we regard its origin or its results; for, unlike them, it was not a deliberate forgery, and, unlike them also, it did not create a dogma. I only quote this criticism to show how much prejudice may be raised against the truth by the retention of interpolations like this; nor can we hold ourselves free from blame if such statements are made and accepted so long as we take no steps to eject from our Bibles an intrusive passage against which external and internal evidence alike have pronounced a decisive verdict. In this instance our later English Bibles have retrograded from the more truthful position of the earlier. In Tyndale's, Coverdale's, and the Great Bibles, the spurious words are placed in brackets and printed in a different type, and thus attention is directed to their suspicious character. In Luther's German Translation (in its original form), as also in the Zurich Latin Bible of 1543, they were omitted. In the Geneva Testament first, so far as I am aware, and in the Bishops' Bible after it, the example was set, which the translators of our Authorized Version unhappily followed, of dispensing with these marks of doubtful genuineness, and printing the passage uniformly with the context.

In other doctrinal passages where important various readings occur, the solution will not be so simple; but in doubt-

ful cases the margin may usefully be employed. Altogether, the instances in which doctrine is directly or indirectly involved are very few; and, though individual texts might be altered, the balance of doctrinal statement would probably not be disturbed by the total result, a change in one direction being compensated by a change in the other. Thus, for instance, if the reading "God was manifest in the flesh" should have to give place to "Who was manifest in the flesh" in 1 Tim. iii., 16, and retire to the margin, yet, on the other hand, the "Only-begotten God" would seem to have equal or superior claims to "the Only-begotten Son" in John i., 18, and must either supersede it, or claim a place side by side with it.

The passages which touch Christian sentiment, or history, or morals, and which are affected by textual differences, though less rare than the former, are still very few. Of these, the pericope of the woman taken in adultery holds the first place in importance. In this case a deference to the most ancient authorities, as well as a consideration of internal evidence, might seem to involve immediate loss. The best solution would probably be to place the passage in brackets, for the purpose of showing, not, indeed, that it contains an untrue narrative (for, whencesoever it comes, it seems to bear on its face the highest credentials of authentic history), but that evidence external and internal is against its being regarded as an integral portion of the original Gospel of St. John. The close of St. Mark's Gospel should possibly be treated in the same way. If I might venture a conjecture, I should say that both the one and the other were due to that knot of early disciples who gathered about St. John in Asia Minor, and must have preserved more than one true tradition of the Lord's life and of the earliest days of the Church, of which some, at least, had themselves been eye-witnesses.*

Again, in St. Luke's Gospel, it might be right to take ac-

* The account of the woman taken in adultery is known to have been related by Papias, a disciple of this school, early in the second century, who also speaks of the Gospel of St. Mark. Euseb., *H. E.*, iii., 39.

count of certain remarkable omissions in some texts, and probably in these cases a marginal note would be the best solution. Such, for instance, are the words addressed to James and Luke, ix., 55, "Ye know not of what spirit ye are;" or the agony in the garden, xxii., 43, 44; or the solemn words on the cross, xxiii., 34. It seems impossible to believe that these incidents are other than authentic; and as the text of St. Luke's Gospel is perhaps exceptional in this respect (for the omissions in St. John's Gospel are of a different kind), the solution will suggest itself that the evangelist himself may have issued two separate editions. This conjecture will be confirmed by observing that in the second treatise of St. Luke similar traces of two editions are seen where the passages omitted in many texts, though not important in themselves (*e.g.*, xxviii., 16, 29), bear equal evidence of authenticity, and are entirely free from suspicion on the ground that they were inserted to serve any purpose, devotional or doctrinal.

On the other hand, some passages, where the external testimony is equivocal or adverse, are open to suspicion, because the origin of, or the motive for, the insertions or alterations lies on the surface. Thus, in St. Luke, ii., 33, "his father" is altered into "Joseph;" and ten verses later, "Joseph and his mother" is substituted for "his parents," evidently because the transcriber was alarmed lest the doctrine of the Incarnation might be imperiled by such language; an alarm not entertained by the evangelist himself, whose own narrative directly precluded any false inference, and who therefore could use the popular language without fear of misapprehension. And again, the mention of "fasting" in connection with praying in not less than four passages (Matt. xvii., 21; Mark ix., 29; Acts x., 30; 1 Cor. vii., 5), in all of which it is rejected by one or more of the best editors, shows an *ascetic bias;* though, indeed, there is ample sanction elsewhere in the New Testament for the practice which it was thus sought to enforce more strongly. Again, allowance must be made for the influence of *liturgical usage* in such passages as the

doxology to the Lord's Prayer, Matt. vi., 13; and a similar explanation may be given of the insertion of the eunuch's confession of faith preparatory to baptism, Acts viii., 37. And, again, when a *historical difficulty* is avoided by a various reading, this should be taken into account, as in Mark i., 1, where, indeed, the substitution of *ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ* for the common reading *ἐν τοῖς προφήταις* would introduce a difficulty the same in kind, but less in magnitude, than already exists in the received text of Matt. xxvii., 9. Or, lastly, the desire to bring out the presence of a *supernatural agency* may have had its influence in procuring the insertion of the words describing the descent of the angel in John v., 3, 4. On the other hand, in some cases these considerations of internal probability favor the existing text, where external evidence taken alone might lead to a different result, as in 1 Cor. xv., 51, where the received reading *πάντες οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα*, is so recommended against *πάντες κοιμηθησόμεθα, οὐ πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα.*

I believe that I have not only indicated (so far as my space allows) the really important classes of various readings, but given the most prominent illustrations in each instance. The whole number of such readings, indeed, is small, and only a very few remain after the examples already brought forward. On the other hand, variations of a subordinate kind are more numerous. These occur more frequently in the Gospel than elsewhere, arising out of the attempt to supplement the evangelical narrative by the insertion of a word or a clause from another, or to bring the one into literal conformity with the other by substitution or correction; but no considerations of moment are involved in the rectification of such passages. It is very rarely indeed that a various reading of this class rises to the interest of Matt. xix., 17, *τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ* (compared with Mark x., 18; Luke xviii., 19); and, for the most part, they are wholly unimportant as regards any doctrinal or practical bearing.

The same motive which operates so powerfully in the Gos-

pels will also influence, though in a far less degree, the text of those epistles which are closely allied to each other, as, for instance, the Romans and Galatians, or the Ephesians and Colossians, and will be felt, moreover, in isolated parallel passages elsewhere; but, for the most part, the corruptions in the epistles are due to the carelessness of scribes, or to their officiousness exercised on the grammar or the style. The restoration of the best supported reading is in almost every instance a gain, either as establishing a more satisfactory connection of sentences, or as substituting a more forcible expression for a less forcible (*e. g.*, *παραβολευσάμενος* for *παραβουλευσάμενος*, Phil. ii., 30), or in other ways giving point to the expression, and bringing out a better and clearer sense (*e. g.*, Rom. iv., 19, *κατενόησεν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα . . . εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ διεκρίθη* for *οὐ κατενόησεν*, κ.τ.λ., where the point is that Abraham *did* fully recognize his own condition, and *notwithstanding* was not staggered; or 2 Cor. i., 20, *ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ναὶ, διὸ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀμὴν*, κ.τ.λ., where *ναὶ* denotes the fulfillment of the promise on the part of God, and *ἀμὴν* the recognition and thanksgiving on the part of the Church, a distinction which is obliterated by the received reading *ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ναὶ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ἀμὴν*; or 2 Cor. xii., 1, *καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ, οὐ συμφέρον μέν, ἐλεύσομαι δὲ*, κ.τ.λ., where the common text, *καυχᾶσθαι δὴ οὐ συμφέρει μοι, ἐλεύσομαι γὰρ*, κ.τ.λ., is feeble in comparison). It is this very fact, that reading of the older authorities almost always exhibits some improvement in the sense (even though the change may be unimportant in itself), which gives us the strongest assurance of their trustworthiness as against the superior numbers of the more recent copies.

Altogether it may be safely affirmed that the permanent value of the new revision will depend in a great degree on the courage and fidelity with which it deals with questions of readings. If the signs of the times may be trusted, the course which is most truthful will also be most politic. To be conservative, it will be necessary to be adequate, for no revision which fails to deal fairly with these textual problems

can be lasting. Here also the example of St. Jerome is full of encouragement.

§ 2.

From errors in the Greek text which our translators used, we may pass on to faults of actual translation. And here I will commence with one class which is not unimportant in itself, and which claims to be considered first, because the translators have dwelt at some length on the matter, and attempted to justify their mode of proceeding. I refer to the various renderings of the same word or words, by which artificial distinctions are introduced in the translation which have no place in the original. This is perhaps the only point in which they proceed deliberately on a wrong principle. "We have not tied ourselves," they say in the Preface, "to a uniformity of phrasing or to an identity of words." They plead that such a course would savor "more of curiosity than wisdom," and they allege the quaint reason that they might "be charged (by scoffers) with some unequal dealing towards a great number of English words" if they adopted one to the exclusion of another, as a rendering of the same Greek equivalent. Now, if they had restricted themselves within proper limits in the use of this liberty, no fault could have been found with this vindication; but when the translation of the same word is capriciously varied in the same paragraph, and even in the same verse, a false effect is inevitably produced, and the connection will in some cases be severed, or the reader more or less seriously misled in other ways. To what extent they have thus attempted to improve upon the original by introducing variety, the following examples, though they might be multiplied many times, will suffice to show.

Why, for instance, should we read in Matthew xviii., 33, "Shouldest not thou also have had *compassion* (ἐλεῆσαι) on thy fellow-servant, even as I had *pity* (ἠλέησα) on thee;" or in xx., 20, "Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's *children* (υἱῶν) with her *sons* (υἱῶν);" or in xxv., 32, "He shall *separate*

(ἀφοριεῖ) them one from another, as a shepherd *divideth* (ἀφορίζει) his sheep from the goats?" Why, in St. John xvi., 1, 4, 6, should ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν be rendered in three different ways in the same paragraph: "These things have I spoken unto you," "These things have I told you," "I have said these things unto you;" or St. Thomas be made to say, "*Put* my finger," and "*Thrust* my hand," in the same verse, though the same Greek word βάλω stands for both (xx., 25)? Why again, in the Acts (xxvi., 24, 25), should Festus cry, "Paul, thou art *beside* thyself" (μαίνῃ, Παῦλε), and St. Paul reply, "I am not *mad*, most noble Festus" (οὐ μαίνομαι, κράτιστε Φῆστε)? Why, in the Epistle to the Romans (x., 15), should οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην, τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων τὰ ἀγαθά be translated "the feet of them that *preach the Gospel* of peace, and *bring glad tidings* of good things?" Why, in the same epistle (xv., 4, 5), should we read, "That we through patience and *comfort* of the Scriptures (διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν) should have hope," and in the next sentence, "Now the God of patience and *consolation* (ὁ Θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως) grant you to be like minded," though the words are identical in the two clauses, and the repetition is obviously intended by St. Paul? And why again, in the salutations at the end of this epistle, as also of others, should ἀσπάσασθε be translated now "salute" and now "greet," the two renderings being interchanged capriciously and without any law? Again, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, iii., 17, the same word φθείρειν is differently translated, "If any man defile (φθείρει) the temple of God, him shall God destroy (φθερεῖ)," though the force of the passage depends on the identity of the sin and the punishment. And in a later passage (x., 16 seq.), κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου is translated "*partakers* of the altar," and two verses below, κοινωνοὶ τῶν δαιμονίων, "have *fellowship* with devils," while (to complete the confusion) in a preceding and a succeeding verse the rendering "be *partakers*" is assigned to μετέχειν, and in the same paragraph κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος, τοῦ σώματος, is translated "*communion* of

the blood, of the body." The exigencies of the English might demand some slight variation of rendering here, but this utter confusion is certainly not required; and yet this passage is only a sample of what occurs in numberless other places. Again, in the same epistle (xii., 4 seq.), it is not easy to see why διαιρέσεις χαρισμάτων, διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν, διαιρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων, are translated respectively "*diversities* of gifts," "*differences* of administration," "*diversities* of operations," while in the same passage ἐνεργήματα is rendered first *operations* and then *working*. Each time I read the marvelous episode on charity in the xiiith chapter, I feel with increased force the inimitable delicacy, and beauty, and sublimity of the rendering, till I begin to doubt whether the English language is not a better vehicle than even the Greek for so lofty a theme; yet even here I find some blemishes of this kind. Thus, in the 8th verse, the same English word "fail" is given as a rendering for both ἐκπίπτειν and καταργεῖσθαι, while conversely the same Greek word καταργεῖσθαι is translated first by *fail* and then by *vanish away*, and two verses afterward, where it occurs again, by a third expression, *be done away*. This word καταργεῖν is translated with the same latitude later on also (xv., 24, 26), "When he shall have *put down* (καταργήσῃ) all rule, and all authority, and power," and immediately afterward, "The last enemy that shall be *destroyed* (καταργεῖται) is death." Let me add another instance from this epistle, for it is perhaps the most characteristic of all. In xv., 27, 28, the word ὑποτάσσειν occurs six times in the same sense within two verses; in the first three places it is rendered *put under*, in the fourth *be subdued*, in the fifth *be subject*, while in the last place the translators return again to their first rendering *put under*. Nay, even the simple word λογία, when it occurs in successive verses (xvi., 1, 2), has a different rendering, first "collection" and then "gathering."

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians is especially remarkable for the recurrence, through whole sentences or paragraphs, of the same word or words, which thus strike the

key-note to the passage. This fact is systematically disregarded by our translators, who, impressed with the desire of producing what they seem to have regarded as an agreeable variety, failed to see that in such cases monotony is force. Thus, in the first chapter, the words παρακαλεῖν, παράκλησις, and θλίβειν, θλῖψις, occur again and again. In the rendering of the first our translators are divided between *comfort* and *consolation*, and of the second between *tribulation*, *trouble*, and *affliction*. Again, in the opening of the second chapter, where the tone is given to the paragraph by the frequent repetition of λύπη, λυπεῖν, we have three distinct renderings, *heaviness*, *sorrow*, *grief*. Again, in the third chapter, several instances of this fault occur. In the first verse this passion for variety is curiously illustrated. They render συστατικῶν ἐπιστολῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἢ ἐξ ὑμῶν συστατικῶν by "*Epistles* of commendation to you or *letters* of commendation from you," where even in supplying a word (which were better left out altogether) they make a change, though in the original the adjectives refer to the same substantive. In this same chapter, again, they hover between *sufficient* and *able* as a rendering of ἱκανός, ἱκανοῦν, ἱκανότης (ver. 5, 6), while later on they interchange *abolish* and *done away* for καταργεῖσθαι (ver. 7, 13, 14), and fail to preserve the connection of ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ (ver. 18) with κάλυμμα (ver. 13 seq.) and ἀνακαλυπτομενον (ver. 14) and of κεκαλυμμένον (iv., 3) with all three. Again, in the fifth chapter, ἐνδημεῖν is rendered in the same context *to be at home* and *to be present* (ver. 6, 8, 9), where the former rendering, moreover, in ver. 6, obscures the direct opposition to ἐκδημεῖν, this last word being rendered throughout *to be absent;* and a little later (ver. 10), τοὺς πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι, κ.τ.λ., is translated "We must all *appear* before the judgment seat of Christ," where, independently of the fatal objection that *appear* gives a wrong sense (for the context lays stress on the *manifestation* of men's true characters at the great day), this rendering is still further faulty, as severing the connection with what follows immediately (ver. 11), "We are *made manifest*

(πεφανερώμεθα) unto God, and I trust also are *made manifest* (πεφανερῶσθαι) in your consciences." Again, in vii., 7, *consolation* and *comfort* are once more interchanged for παρακαλεῖν, παράκλησις; in viii., 10, 11, 12, τὸ θέλειν is translated *to be forward* and *to will*, and προθυμία *readiness* and *a willing mind* in successive verses; in ix., 2, 3, 4, 5, *ready* and *prepared* are both employed in rendering παρεσκεύασται, παρεσκευασμένοι, ἀπαρασκευάστους, while conversely the single expression "be ready" is made to represent both παρεσκεύασται and ἑτοίμην εἶναι; in x., 13, 15, 16, κανών, after being twice translated *rule*, is varied in the third passage by *line;* in xi., 16, 17, 18, the rendering of καυχᾶσθαι, καύχησις, is diversified by *boast* and *glory;* and in xii., 2, 3, οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ Θεὸς οἶδεν, is twice translated "I *can not tell*, God *knoweth*," while elsewhere in these same verses οἶδα is rendered "I *know*," and οὐκ οἶδα, "I *can not tell*." This repugnance to repeating the same word for οἶδα has a parallel in John xvi., 30, where νῦν οἴδαμεν ὅτι οἶδας πάντα is given, "Now *are we sure* that thou *knowest* all things."

Nor is there any improvement in the later books, as the following instances, taken almost at random from a very large number which might have been adduced, will show: Phil. ii., 13, "It is God which *worketh* (ἐνεργῶν) in you both to will and *to do* (ἐνεργεῖν);" Phil. iii., 3 sq., "And *have no confidence* (οὐ πεποιθότες) in the flesh; Though I might also *have confidence* (ἔχων πεποίθησιν) in the flesh; If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof *he might trust* (δοκεῖ πεποιθέναι) in the flesh, I more . . . *as touching* the law (κατὰ νόμον), a Pharisee; *concerning* zeal (κατὰ ζῆλος), persecuting the Church; *touching* the righteousness (κατὰ δικαιοσύνην) which is in the law, blameless;" 1 Thess. ii., 4, "As we were *allowed* (δεδοκιμάσμεθα) of God . . . not as pleasing men, but God, which *trieth* (δοκιμάζοντι) our hearts;" 2 Thess. i., 6, "To recompense *tribulation* to them that *trouble* you" (ἀνταποδοῦναι τοῖς θλίβουσιν ὑμᾶς θλῖψιν); Heb. viii., 13, "He hath *made* the first *old* (πεπαλαίωκεν τὴν πρώτην); now that which *decayeth* (παλαιούμενον) and *waxeth old* (γηράσκον) is ready to vanish away;" James ii., 2, 3, "If there

*come* (εἰσέλθῃ) unto your assembly a man with a gold ring *in goodly apparel* (ἐν ἐσθῆτι λαμπρᾷ), and there *come in* (εἰσέλθῃ) also a poor man in vile *raiment* (ἐσθῆτι), and ye have respect to him that weareth *the gay clothing* (τὴν ἐσθῆτα τὴν λαμπράν), etc.;" 2 Pet. ii., 1, 3, "Who privily shall bring in *damnable heresies* (αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας) . . . and bring on themselves swift *destruction* (ἀπώλειαν) . . . and their *damnation* (ἀπώλεια) slumbereth not;" 1 John v., 9, 10, "This is the *witness* (μαρτυρία) of God which he *hath testified* (μεμαρτύρηκεν) of his Son . . . He believeth not the *record* (μαρτυρίαν) that God *gave* (μεμαρτύρηκεν) of his Son;" Rev. i., 15, "His *voice* (φωνή) as the *sound* (φωνή) of many waters;" iii., 17, "I am *rich* (πλούσιος) and *increased in goods* (πεπλούτηκα);" xvii., 6, 7, "And when I saw her, I *wondered* (ἐθαύμασα) with great *admiration* (θαῦμα); and the angel said unto me, Wherefore didst thou *marvel* (ἐθαύμασας):" xviii., 2, "And *the hold* (φυλακή) of every foul spirit, and *a cage* (φυλακή) of every unclean and hateful bird."

In the instances hitherto given the variation of rendering is comparatively unimportant, but for this very reason they serve well to illustrate the wrong principle on which our translators proceeded. In such cases, no more serious consequences may result than a loss of point and force; but elsewhere the injury done to the understanding of the passage is graver. Thus, when the English reader finds in St. Matthew xxv., 46, "These shall go away into *everlasting* (αἰώνιον) punishment, but the righteous into life *eternal* (αἰώνιον)," he is led to speculate on the difference of meaning between "everlasting" and "eternal," if he happens to have any slight acquaintance with modern controversy, and he will most probably be led to a wrong conclusion by observing different epithets used, more especially as the antithesis of the clauses helps to emphasize the difference. Or take instances where the result will not be misunderstanding, but non-understanding. Thus, in the apocalyptic passage 2 Thess. ii., 6, 7, "And now ye know what *withholdeth* (τὸ κατέχων) . . . only he who now *letteth* (ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι) will let," the same word should certainly have been

repeated, that the identity of the thing signified might be clear; and in the doctrinal statement, Col. ii., 9, 10, "In him dwelleth all the *fullness* (τὸ πλήρωμα) of the Godhead bodily, and ye are *complete* (πεπληρωμένοι) in him," it was still more necessary to preserve the connection by a similar rendering, for the main idea of the second clause is the *communication of the* πλήρωμα which resides in Christ to the believers (comp. Ephes. i., 23). Again, the word θρόνος in the Revelation is translated *throne* when it refers to our Lord, but *seat* when it refers to the faithful (iv., 4; xi., 16*) or when it refers to Satan (ii., 13; xvi., 10). Now by this variation, as Archbishop Trench has pointed out,† two great ideas which run through this Book, and indeed, we may say, through the whole of the New Testament, are obliterated; the one, that the true servants of Christ are crowned with him and share his sovereignty; the other, that the antagonism of the Prince of Darkness to the Prince of Light develops itself in "the hellish parody of the heavenly kingdom." And in other passages, again, the connection between different parts of the same discourse or the same narrative is severed. Thus, in St. Luke xix., 13, 15, the nobleman, going into a far country, gives charge to his servants πραγματεύσασθε ἐν ᾧ ἔρχομαι, and when he returns he summons them ἵνα γνῷ [or γνοῖ] τίς τι διεπραγματεύσαντο. If the former had been translated, "*Trade* ye till I come," it would then have corresponded to the nobleman's subsequent demand of them to "know how much each man had gained by *trading*." But the rendering of our translators, "*Occupy* till I come," besides involving a somewhat unintelligible archaism, disconnects the two, and the first indication which the English reader gets that the servants were expected to employ the money in trade is when the master at length comes to reckon with them. Another instance, where the connection is not, indeed, wholly broken (for the context will not suffer this), but greatly impaired, is Matt. v., 15, 16,

* Rev. iv., 4, "And round the throne (θρόνου) were four-and-twenty seats (θρόνοι)."

† *On the Authorized Version*, p. 80 seq.

λάμπει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ· οὕτως λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, which should run, "It *shineth* upon all that are in the house: *Even so* let your light *shine* before men, etc." But in our translation, "It *giveth light* unto all that are in the house: Let your light *so shine* before men that they may see your good works, etc.," the two sentences are detached from each other by the double error of rendering λάμπει, λαμψάτω by different words, and of misunderstanding οὕτως. I say "misunderstanding," because the alternative that "so" is a mere ambiguity of expression seems to be precluded by the fact that in our Communion Service the words "Let your light *so* shine before men, etc.," detached from their context, are chosen as the *initial* sentence at the Offertory, where the correct meaning, "in like manner," could not stand.

This love of variety might be still further illustrated by their treatment of the *component parts* of words. Thus there is no reason why πολυμέρως καὶ πολυτρόπως in Heb. i., 1, should be translated "At *sundry* times and in *divers* manners," even though for want of a better word we should allow the very inadequate rendering *times* to pass muster, where the original points to the divers *parts* of one great comprehensive scheme. And again, in Mark xii., 39 (comp. Matt. xxiii., 6), it is equally difficult to see why πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις should be rendered "the *chief* seats in the synagogues and the *uppermost* rooms at feasts." On the archaic rendering "room" for the second element in πρωτοκλισία I shall have something to say hereafter.

These instances which have been given will suffice. But, in fact, examples illustrating this misconception of a translator's duty are sown broadcast over our New Testament, so that there is scarcely a page without one or more. It is due to our translators, however, to say, that in many cases which I have examined they only perpetuated and did not introduce the error, which may often be traced to Tyndale himself, from whom our version is ultimately derived; and in some instances his variations are even greater than theirs. Thus, in

a passage already quoted, 1 Cor. xii., 4 seq., he has three different renderings of διαιρέσεις in the three successive clauses where they have only two: "Ther are *diversities* of gyftes verely, yet but one sprete, and ther are *differences* of administration and yet but one lorde, and ther are *divers maners* of operacions and yet but one God;" and in Rom. xvi., his interchanges of "salute" and "greet" are still more frequent than theirs. Of all the English versions the Rhemish alone has paid attention to this point, and so far compares advantageously with the rest, to which in most other respects it is confessedly inferior. And I suppose that the words of our Translators' Preface, in which they attempt to justify their course, must refer indirectly to this Roman Catholic Version, more especially as I find that its Latinisms are censured in the same paragraph. If so, it is to be regretted that prejudice should have blinded them to a consideration of some importance.

But not only is it necessary to preserve the same word in the same context and in the same book; equal care should be taken to secure uniformity where it occurs in the same connection in different passages and different books. Thus, where quotations are given once or more from the Old Testament in the New, the rendering should exhibit (as far as possible) the exact coincidence with or divergence from the original and one another in the language. Again, when the same discourses or the same incidents are recorded by different evangelists, it is especially important to reproduce the features of the original, neither obliterating nor creating differences. Again, in parallel passages in allied epistles, as, for instance, those of St. Paul to the Romans and Galatians, or to the Colossians and Ephesians, or the Epistle of St. Jude and the Second Epistle of St. Peter, the exact amount of resemblance should be reproduced, because questions of date and authenticity are affected thereby. Again, in the writings which claim the same authorship, as, for instance, the Gospel and Epistles and the Apocalypse of St. John, the similarity

of diction should be preserved. Though this will be a somewhat laborious task, let us hope that our new revisers will exercise constant vigilance in this matter. As the authors of our Received Version allowed themselves so much license in the same context, it is no surprise that they did not pay any attention to these coincidences of language which occur in separate parts of the New Testament, and which did not, therefore, force themselves on their notice.

Of their mode of dealing with quotations from the Old Testament, one or two instances will suffice by way of illustration.

Deut. xxxii., 35 is twice quoted in exactly the same words. In our English Version it appears in these two forms:

| Rom. xii., 19. | Heb. x., 30. |
|---|---|
| Vengeance is mine: I will repay, saith the Lord. | Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. |

Again, the same words, Gen. xv., 6 (LXX.), *ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην*, are given with these variations: Rom. iv., 3, "It was *counted unto* him for righteousness;" Rom. iv., 22, "It was *imputed unto* him for righteousness;" Gal. iii., 6, "It was *accounted to* him for righteousness" (with a marginal note, "or *imputed*"); James ii., 23, "It was *imputed to* him for righteousness;" while in an indirect reference to it, Rom. iv., 9 (in the immediate context of two of these divergent renderings), a still further variation is introduced: "We say that faith was *reckoned to* Abraham for righteousness."

Again, *καλύψει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν* (from Prov. x., 12) is translated in James v., 20, "shall *hide a* multitude of sins," and in 1 Pet. iv., 8, "shall *cover the* multitude of sins" (with a marginal reading "will" for "shall").

The variation in the last instance which I shall give is still more astonishing, because the two quotations of the same passage (Psa. xcv., 11) occur in the same context.

| Heb. iii., 11. | Heb. iv., 3. |
| --- | --- |
| *So* I *sware* in my wrath, *They shall not* enter into my rest. | *As* I *have sworn* in my wrath, *If they shall* enter into my rest. |

Here there is absolutely no difference in the Greek of the two passages; and, as the argument is continuous, no justification of the various renderings can be imagined.

On the parallel narratives of the different evangelists it will not be necessary to dwell, because this part of the subject has been discussed at some length elsewhere.* I will content myself with three examples. The first, which affects only the diction, is a fair sample of the defects of our version in this respect, because it is in no way striking or exceptional.

| Matt. xvi., 26. | Mark viii., 36. | Luke ix., 25. |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος, ἐὰν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῇ; | Τί γὰρ ὠφελήσει ἄνθρωπον, ἐὰν κερδήσῃ τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, καὶ ζημιωθῇ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ; | Τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος, κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθείς; |
| "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" | "For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" | "For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world, and lose himself, or be cast away?" |

Here the coincidences and divergences of the first two evangelists are fairly preserved, but the relations of the third to either are wholly confused or obliterated.

My second example shall be of a different kind, where the variation introduced affects not the expression only, but the actual interpretation.

In the explanation of the parable of the sower in St. Mark

* See, for instance, Dean Alford's *By-ways of New Testament Criticism*, Contemporary Review, July, 1868.

iv., 16, *οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπειρόμενοι* is properly translated "they which *are sown* on stony ground," and the corresponding expressions are treated similarly; but in St. Matthew xiii., 20, *ὁ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπαρείς* becomes "He that *received the seed* into stony places," where (besides minor variations) the person is substituted for the seed, and the corresponding expressions throughout the parable are manipulated similarly in defiance of grammar. This rendering is unhappy on many accounts. Besides making the evangelists say different things, it has the still further disadvantage that it destroys one main idea in the parable, the *identification* (for the purposes of the parable) *of the seed when sown with the person himself*, so that the life, and growth, and decay of the one are coincident with the life, and growth, and decay of the other. The form of expression in St. Luke (viii., 14, *τὸ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας πεσὸν οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες*) brings out this identity more prominently; but it is expressed not obscurely in the other evangelists, and should not have been obliterated by our translators in one of them through an ungrammatical paraphrase.

My third example concerns the treatment of a single word. In the account of the scenes preceding the Crucifixion, mention is made of a certain building which by three of the evangelists is called *πραιτώριον*. In St. Matthew (xxvii., 27) it is translated "common-hall," with a marginal alternative "governor's house;" in St. John (xviii., 28, 33; xix., 9), "hall of judgment" and "judgment-hall," with a marginal alternative, "Pilate's house," in the first passage; while in St. Mark (xv., 16) it is reproduced in the English as "prætorium." It should be added that this same word, when it occurs in the same sense, though referring to a different locality, in Acts xxiii., 35, is rendered "judgment-hall," though a "judgment-hall" would obviously be an unfit place to keep a prisoner in ward; and again, in Phil. i., 13, *ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ* (where probably it signifies the "prætorian army," but where our English translators have taken it to mean another such building), it appears as "palace." This last rendering might very

properly have been adopted in all the passages in the Gospels and Acts, as adequately expressing the meaning.

So, also, in those epistles which are allied to each other,* the treatment of identical words and expressions is neither more nor less unsatisfactory than in the Gospels.

In the instances already given, though there may be differences of opinion as to the importance of the subject, all probably will agree on the main point, that it is advisable to preserve uniformity of rendering. The illustration which I shall next select is more open to criticism; and as Archbishop Trench, and Dean Alford, and the Five Clergymen all take a different view from my own,† I can hardly hope that my argument will carry general conviction. Yet the case seems to be strong. I refer to the translation of παράκλητος in the Gospel and in the First Epistle of St. John. In the former it is consistently translated *Comforter* (xiv., 16, 26; xv., 26; xvi., 7), while in the one passage where it occurs in the latter (ii., 1) the rendering *Advocate* is adopted. Is there sufficient reason for this difference? No one, probably, would wish to alter the word "Advocate" in the Epistle, for the expressions in the context, "with the Father," "Jesus Christ the *righteous* (δίκαιον)," "a propitiation for our sins," fix the sense, so that the passage presents a sufficiently close parallel with the common forensic language of St. Paul (e.g., Rom. iii., 24–26). But why should the same word be rendered "Comforter" in the Gospel? Now I think it may fairly be maintained, *first*, that the word παράκλητος in itself means "Advocate," and can not mean "Comforter;" and, *secondly*, that the former rendering is more appropriate to the context in all the passages in which it occurs.

* See Blunt's *Duties of the Parish Priest*, p. 71; Ellicott's *Revision of the English New Testament*, p. 101.

† To the same effect also writes Archdeacon Hare, *Mission of the Comforter*, Note J, p. 523: "At present, so many sacred associations have connected themselves for generation after generation with the name of *the Comforter*, that it would seem something like an act of sacrilege to change it." Yet he agrees substantially with the view of the meaning which I have maintained in the text.

On the *first* point—the meaning of the word—usage appears to be decisive. It commonly signifies "one who is summoned to the side of another (παρακαλεῖται)" to aid him in a court of justice, and more particularly "an advocate" or "a pleader," being applied especially to the "counsel for the *defense*;"* nor, so far as I am aware, does it ever bear any other sense, except perhaps in some later ecclesiastical writers whose language has been influenced by a false interpretation of these passages in St. John. In other words παράκλητος is passive, not active; one who παρακαλεῖται, not one who παρακαλεῖ; one who "is summoned to plead a cause," not one who "exhorts, or encourages, or comforts." Nor, indeed, if we compare the simple word κλητός and the other compounds ἀνάκλητος, ἔγκλητος, ἔκκλητος, ἐπίκλητος, σύγκλητος, etc., or if we observe the general rule affecting adjectives similarly formed from transitive verbs, does it seem easy to assign an active sense to παράκλητος. Yet it can hardly be doubted that the rendering "Comforter" was reached by attributing this active force to παράκλητος, and that therefore it arises out of an error; for the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, is again and again explained by the fathers as one who παρακαλεῖ,† encourages or comforts men; and the fact that even Greek writers are found to explain the

* See Hermann, *Griech. Antiq.*, iii., § 142, p. 320. The origin of this sense is illustrated by such passages as Æschines *c. Ctesiph.*, § 200, *καὶ τί ἐεῖ σε Δημοσθένη παρακαλεῖν; ὅταν δ' ὑπερπηδήσας τὴν δικαίαν ἀπολογίαν παρακαλῇς κακοῦργον ἄνθρωπον καὶ τεχνίτην λόγων, κλέπτεις τὴν ἀκρόασιν, κ.τ.λ.*

† So Origen, *De Princ.*, ii., 7 (i., p. 93), a passage which unfortunately is extant only in the Latin, but in which (if correctly represented) Origen takes παράκλητος both in the Gospel and in the Epistle in an active sense, explaining it, however, *consolator* in the Gospel and *deprecator* in the Epistle. See also Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.*, xvi., 20 (p. 255), *παράκλητος δὲ καλεῖται διὰ τὸ παρακαλεῖν καὶ παραμυθεῖσθαι καὶ συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῆς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν.* And many of the Greek fathers explain it similarly. The fact to be observed is, that even in the Epistle, where it manifestly has the sense "Advocate," they equally derive it from παρακαλεῖν, and not παρακαλεῖσθαι, thus giving it an active force, whereas the passage quoted in the last note shows that the meaning "Advocate" is not to be derived in this way. The Latin fathers generally follow the old Latin "Advocatus;" but Hilary, though most frequently giving "Advocatus," yet once, at least, renders it "Consolator" (*in Psalm.* cxxv., i., p. 461).

word thus is the only substantial argument (so far as I know) which has been brought against the view here maintained. It is urged, indeed, that the word "Comforter," being derived from the Latin "confortator," "strengthener," and therefore implying something more than "comfort" in the restricted sense of "consolation," adequately represents the function of the παράκλητος, who thus strengthens the cause and confirms the courage of the accused at the bar of justice. But the history of the interpretation, as already given, shows that this rendering was not reached in the way assumed, but was based on a grammatical error, and therefore this account can only be accepted as an apology after the fact, and not as an explanation of the fact. Moreover, it is not fair translating to substitute a subordinate and accidental conception for the leading sense of a word. And, lastly, whatever may be the derivation of "Comforter," the word does not now suggest this idea to the English reader.

But, *secondly*, if "Advocate" is the only sense which παράκλητος can properly bear, it is also (as I can not but think) the sense which the context suggests wherever the word is used in the Gospel. In other words, the idea of pleading, arguing, convincing, instructing, convicting, is prominent in every instance.* Thus, in xiv., 16 seq., the Paraclete is described as the "Spirit of *truth*" whose reasonings fall dead on the ear of the world, and are vocal only to the faithful (ὃ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν . . . ὑμεῖς γινώσκετε αὐτό). In xiv., 26, again, the function of the Paraclete is described in similar language, "He shall *teach* you all things, and *remind* you of all things." In xv., 26, he is once more designated the "Spirit of truth," and here the office assigned to him is to *bear witness* of Christ. And, lastly, in xvi., 7 seq., the idea of the *pleader* appears still more definitely in the context, for it is there declared that "he

* In xiv., 18, the English Version, "I will not leave you *comfortless*," lends a fictitious aid to the sense "Comforter," to which the original οὐκ ἀφήσω ὑμᾶς ὀρφανοὺς gives no encouragement. The margin, however, offers the alternative "orphans" for ὀρφανούς.

shall convince" or "convict (ἐλέγξει) the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." And generally it may be said that the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, is represented in these passages as the Advocate, the Counsel, who suggests true reasonings to our minds and true courses of action for our lives, who convicts our adversary the World of wrong, and pleads our cause before God our Father. In short, the conception (though somewhat more comprehensive) is substantially the same as in St. Paul's language when describing the function of the Holy Ghost: "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are children of God;" "The Spirit helpeth our infirmities; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which can not be uttered (Rom. viii., 16, 26.)"

Thus, whether we regard the origin of the word, or whether we consider the requirements of the context,* it would seem that "Comforter" should give way to "Advocate" as the in-

* In a case like this we should naturally expect tradition to aid in determining the correct sense, and for this purpose should apply to the earliest versions as giving it in its best authenticated form; but in the instance before us they do not render as much assistance as usual. (1.) The Old *Latin* seems certainly to have had *Advocatus* originally in all the four passages of the Gospel, as also in the passage of the Epistle. It is true that in the existing texts *Paracletus* (or *Paraclitus*) occurs in one or more of the passages, and in some MSS. in the others; but the earliest quotations from Tertullian onward must be considered decisive on this point. So far, therefore, tradition favors the sense which I am maintaining. Jerome retained the Greek word "Paracletus" in the Gospel, but gave "Advocatus" in the Epistle. It would appear, however, that "Paracletus" had already displaced "Advocatus" in some passages in the Gospel in one or more of the many texts of the Old Latin which were current in the fourth century. (2.) In the *Syriac* versions the Greek word is retained. This is the case with the Curetonian in John xiv., 16 (the only passage preserved in this version), and with the Peshito throughout in both the Gospel and the Epistle. (3.) In the *Egyptian* versions also this is generally the case. In the Memphitic παράκλητος appears in all the passages. In the Thebaic the rendering is different in the Gospels and in the Epistle. In the Epistle it is given, "One that prayeth (entreateth) for (over) us;" but in the Gospel (at least in xiv., 16; xv., 26) the Greek word is retained. These parts of the Gospel in the Thebaic Version are not published, so far as I am aware; but I am enabled to state these facts from some manuscript additions made by Dr. Tattam in my copy of Woide which was formerly in his possession.

terpretation of παράκλητος. The word "Comforter" does indeed express a true office of the Holy Spirit, as our most heartfelt experiences will tell us. Nor has the rendering, though inadequate, been without its use in fixing this fact in our minds; but the function of the Paraclete, as our Advocate, is even more important, because wider and deeper than this. Nor will the idea of the "Comforter" be lost to us by the change, for the English *Te Deum* will still remain to recall this office of the Paraclete to our remembrance, while the restoration of the correct rendering in the passages of St. John's Gospel will be in itself an unmixed gain. Moreover (and this is no unimportant fact), the language of the Gospel will thus be linked in the English Version, as it is in the original, with the language of the Epistle. In this there will be a twofold advantage. We shall see fresh force in the words thus rendered, "He will give you *another* Advocate," when we remember that our Lord is styled by St. John our "Advocate:" the advocacy of Christ illustrating and being illustrated by the advocacy of the Spirit. At the same time, we shall bring out another of the many coincidences tending to establish an identity of authorship in the Gospel and Epistle, and thus to make valid for the former all the evidences, external and internal, which may be adduced to prove the genuineness of the latter.

This connection between the Gospel and the Epistle leads me to another illustration, which links the Gospel with the Apocalypse. The idea that the Shechinah, the σκηνή, the glory which betokened the divine presence in the Holy of Holies, and which was wanting to the second Temple, would be restored once more in Messiah's days, was a cherished hope of the Jewish doctors during and after the apostolic ages. In the Apocalypse St. John more than once avails himself of imagery derived from this expectation. Thus, vii., 15, "He that sitteth on the throne shall *dwell among* them (σκηνώσει ἐπ' αὐτούς;" xiii., 6, "He opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name and his *tabernacle* (σκηνήν), and

them that *dwell* (*τοὺς σκηνοῦντας*) in heaven;" xxi., 3, "Behold, the *tabernacle* (*σκηνή*) of God is with men, and he will *dwell* with them (*σκηνώσει μετ' αὐτῶν*)." Here it is much to be regretted that the necessities of the English language required our translators to render the substantive *σκηνὴ* by one word and the verb *σκηνοῦν* by another. In the first passage the significance is entirely lost by translating *σκηνώσει* "shall dwell," combined with the erroneous rendering of *ἐπί*; and no English reader would suspect the reference to the glory, the Shechinah, hovering over the mercy-seat.* But our regret is increased when we turn to the Gospel, for there also the same image reappears in the Greek, but is obliterated by the English rendering: "The Word was made flesh, and *dwelt* (*ἐσκήνωσεν*) among us, and we beheld his *glory*." The two writings, which attribute the name of the Word of God to the Incarnate Son, are the same also which especially connect Messiah's advent with the restitution of the Shechinah, the light or glory which is the visible token of God's presence among men. In this instance the usage of the English language may have deterred our translators. Still they would have earned our gratitude if, following the precedent of the Latin *tabernaculavit*, they had anticipated later scholars, and introduced the verb "to tabernacle" into the English language; or, failing this, if by some slight periphrasis they had endeavored to preserve the unity of idea.

In other cases where artificial distinctions are introduced, our translators must be held blameless, for the exigencies of the English language left them no choice. Thus, in John iii., 8, *τὸ πνεῦμα* (the wind) *ὅπου θέλει* (bloweth) . . . . *οὕτως ἐστὶν πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος* (the Spirit), we must patiently acquiesce in the different renderings, though the comparison between the material and immaterial *πνεῦμα* is impaired thereby, just as in a later passage (xx., 22, *ἐνεφύσησεν*

* In 2 Cor. xii., 9, *ἵνα ἐπισκηνώσῃ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, translated "that the power of Christ *may rest upon* me," there seems to be a similar reference to the symbol of the divine presence in the Holy of Holies.

καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Λάβετε Πνεῦμα ἅγιον) the symbolical act of breathing on the disciples loses much of its force to an English reader. Again, it might be necessary to vary the renderings of ψύχη between "soul" and "life," and of σώζειν between "to save" and "to make whole." But, in case of the former word, such variations as we find, for instance, in Matt. xvi., 25, 26, and the parallel passages, deserve to be reconsidered; and in their treatment of the latter, as Dean Alford has shown,* our translators have diversified the rendering capriciously.

And the same excuse also holds good with another class of words—where a *paronomasia* occurs in the original, but where it is impossible in English at once to preserve the similarity of sound and to give the sense adequately. In Phil. iii., 2, 3, indeed, our translators, following some of the earlier versions, have endeavored to reproduce the paronomasia, "Beware of the *concision* (κατατομήν), for we are the *circumcision* (περιτομή);" but the result is not encouraging, for it may be questioned whether "concision" conveys any idea to the English reader. Again, the attempt is made in Rom. xii., 3, μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, but with no great success, for in the rendering "not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think soberly," the force of the original is evaporated. On the other hand, the rendering of 1 Cor. vii., 31, οἱ χρώμενοι τούτῳ τῷ κόσμῳ [*l.* τὸν κόσμον] ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι, "they that *use* this world as not *abusing* it," is adequate. In other passages, such as Acts viii., 30, γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις, "understandest thou what thou readest?" 2 Cor. iii., 2, γινωσκομένη καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένη, "known and read;" 2 Cor. i., 13, ἃ ἀναγινώσκετε ἢ καὶ ἐπιγινώσκετε, "what you read or acknowledge;" 2 Cor. x., 12, οὐ τολμῶμεν ἐγκρῖναι ἢ συγκρῖναι ἑαυτούς, "we dare not make ourselves of the number or compare ourselves," it would be impossible to reproduce the effect of the original. But in other cases, such as 1 Cor. xii., 2, ὡς ἂν ἤγεσθε, ἀπαγόμενοι, "carried

* Contemporary Review, July, 1868, p. 323.

away as ye were led;" 2 Cor. iv., 8, *ἀπορούμενοι ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξαπορούμενοι*, "we are perplexed, but not in despair;" or 2 Cor. vi., 10, *ὡς μηδὲν ἔχοντες καὶ πάντα κατέχοντες*, "as having nothing, and yet possessing all things," the rendering might be improved. Nor is there any reason why the play on *ἐργαζομένους, περιεργαζομένους*, in 2 Thess. iii., 11, should not be preserved by "business," "busy-bodies;" or why, in Ephes. v., 15, *μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι ἀλλ' ὡς σοφοὶ* should not be rendered "not as unwise, but as wise." In this latter passage the word *ἄσοφος*, which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, has been purposely preferred to the usual *μωρός*. Yet our translators have rendered *ἄσοφοι* "fools" here, and reserved "unwise" for *ἄφρονες*, two verses below, where it is not wanted.

§ 3.

From the creation of artificial distinctions in our English Version by different renderings of the same word, we pass naturally to the opposite fault, the obliteration of real distinctions by the same rendering of different words. The former error is easily corrected for the most part, the latter not always so; for the synonyms of one language frequently can not be reproduced in another without a harsh expression or a cumbersome paraphrase. Thus *οἶδα, γινώσκω, ἔγνωκα, ἐπίσταμαι*, have different shades of meaning in the Greek, but the obvious equivalent for each in English is "I know." Still, some effort should be made (though success is not always possible) to discriminate between them, where they occur in the same context, and where, therefore, their position throws a special emphasis on the distinction. Thus, in Acts xix., 15, we should not acquiesce in "Jesus I know, and Paul I know," as a rendering of *τὸν Ἰησοῦν γινώσκω καὶ τὸν Παῦλον ἐπίσταμαι*, though all the preceding translations unite with our Authorized Version in obliterating the difference. The significant distinction which is made in the original between the kind of recognition in the case of the divine agent and of the human instrument may easily be preserved by rendering "Jesus I

*acknowledge*, and Paul I *know*." Again, in such passages as 2 Cor. v., 16, *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα οἴδαμεν κατὰ σάρκα, εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν* (and this is a type of a large class of passages, where *οἶδα* and *γινώσκω* occur together), some improvement should be attempted; nor, in the instance given, could there be any difficulty in varying the rendering, though elsewhere the task might not prove so easy.

From these allied words I pass on to the distinction between *γινώσκειν* and *ἐπιγινώσκειν*, which is both clearer and more easily dealt with. Those who have paid any attention to the language of St. Paul will recognize the force of the substantive *ἐπίγνωσις* as denoting the advanced or perfect knowledge which is the ideal state of the true Christian, and will remember that it appears only in his later epistles (from the Romans onward), where the more contemplative aspects of the Gospel are brought into view, and its comprehensive and eternal relations more fully set forth. But the power of the preposition appears in the verb no less than in the substantive; and, indeed, its significance is occasionally forced upon our notice, where the simple and the compound verb appear in the same context. Thus, in 1 Cor. xiii., 12, *ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην*, the partial knowledge (*γινώσκειν ἐκ μέρους*, comp. ver. 9) is contrasted with the *full knowledge* (*ἐπιγινώσκειν*) which shall be attained hereafter, though our translators have rendered both words by "know." Yet, strangely enough, where the special force of the compound was less obvious, it has not escaped them; for in 2 Cor. vi., 9, *ὡς ἀγνοούμενοι καὶ ἐπιγινωσκόμενοι* is translated "as unknown, and yet *well known*."

In this particular—the observance of the distinctions between a simple word and its derivatives compounded with prepositions—our English Version is especially faulty. The verb *κρίνειν* and its compounds will supply a good illustration. St. Paul especially delights to accumulate these, and thus, by harping upon words (if I may use the expression), to empha-

size great spiritual truths or important personal experiences. Thus he puts together *συγκρίνειν*, *ἀνακρίνειν*, 1 Cor. ii., 13–15; *κρίνειν*, *ἀνακρίνειν*, 1 Cor. iv., 3, 4; *ἐγκρίνειν*, *συγκρίνειν*, 2 Cor. x., 12; *κρίνειν*, *διακρίνειν*, 1 Cor. vi., 1–6; *κρίνειν*, *διακρίνειν*, *κατακρίνειν*, Rom. xiv., 22, 23; 1 Cor. xi., 29, 31, 32; *κρίνειν*, *κατακρίνειν*, Rom. ii., 1. Now it seems impossible in most cases, without a sacrifice of English which no one would be prepared to make, to reproduce the similarity of sound or the identity of root; but the distinction of sense should always be preserved. How this is neglected in our version, and what confusion ensues from the neglect, the following instances will show. In 1 Cor. iv., 3, 4, 5, *ἐμοὶ δὲ εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν ἵνα ὑφ' ὑμῶν ἀνακριθῶ . . . ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐμαυτὸν ἀνακρίνω . . . ὁ δὲ ἀνακρίνων με Κύριός ἐστιν . . . ὥστε μὴ πρὸ καιροῦ τι κρίνετε, ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὁ Κύριος, ὃς καὶ φωτίσει τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκότους*, the word *ἀνακρίνειν* is translated throughout "judge," while in a previous passage, 1 Cor. ii., 14, 15, it is rendered indifferently "to discern" and "to judge." But *ἀνακρίνειν* is neither "to judge," which is *κρίνειν*, nor "to discern," which is *διακρίνειν*, but "to examine, investigate, inquire into, question," as it is rightly translated elsewhere, e. g., 1 Cor. ix., 3; x., 25, 27; and the correct understanding of the passages before us depends on our retaining this sense. The *ἀνάκρισις*, it will be remembered, was an Athenian law term for a preliminary investigation (distinct from the actual *κρίσις*, or trial), in which evidence was collected, and the prisoner committed for trial if a true bill was found against him. It corresponded, in short, *mutatis mutandis*, to the part taken in English law proceedings by the grand jury. And this is substantially the force of the word here. The apostle condemns all these impatient human *præjudicia*, these unauthorized *ἀνακρίσεις*, which anticipate the final *κρίσις*, reserving his case for the great tribunal, when at length *all* the evidence will be forthcoming, and a satisfactory verdict can be given. Meanwhile this process of gathering evidence has begun; an *ἀνάκρισις* is indeed being held, not, however, by these self-appointed magistrates, but by One who alone

has the authority to institute the inquiry, and the ability to sift the facts: *ὁ δὲ ἀνακρίνων με Κύριός ἐστιν.* Of this half technical sense of the word the New Testament itself furnishes a good example. The examination of St. Paul before Festus is both in name and in fact an *ἀνάκρισις.* The Roman procurator explains to Agrippa how he had directed the prisoner to be brought into court (*προήγαγον αὐτόν*), in order that, having held the preliminary inquiry usual in such cases (*τῆς ἀνακρίσεως γενομένης*), he might be able to lay the case before the emperor (Acts xxv., 26). Thus St. Paul's meaning here suffers very seriously by the wrong turn given to *ἀνακρίνειν*; nor is this the only passage where the sense is impaired thereby. In 1 Cor. xiv., 24, *ἐλέγχεται ὑπὸ πάντων, ἀνακρίνεται ὑπὸ πάντων, [καὶ οὕτω] τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ φανερὰ γίνεται,* the sense required is clearly "sifting, probing, revealing," and the rendering of our translators, "he is judged of all," introduces an idea alien to the passage. Again, only five verses lower down (xiv., 29), another compound of *κρίνειν* occurs and is similarly treated: *προφῆται δε δύο ἢ τρεῖς λαλείτωσαν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι διακρινέτωσαν,* "let the prophets speak two or three, and let the other *judge*," where it would be difficult to attach any precise meaning to the English without the aid of the Greek, and where certainly *διακρινέτωσαν* ought to be rendered "discern" rather than "judge."

Another passage which I shall take to illustrate the mode of dealing with *κρίνειν* and its compounds is still more important. In 1 Cor. xi., 28–34, a passage in which the English rendering is chargeable with some serious practical consequences, and where a little attention to the original will correct more than one erroneous inference, the rendering of *κρίνειν, διακρίνειν, κατακρίνειν,* is utterly confused. The Greek runs *δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτὸν καὶ οὕτως ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ἐσθιέτω καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου πινέτω· ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων [ἀναξίως] κρίμα ἑαυτῷ ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει, μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα [τοῦ Κυρίου] . . . εἰ δὲ ἑαυτοὺς διεκρίνομεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐκρινόμεθα, κρινόμενοι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου παιδευόμεθα, ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν . . . . εἴ τις*

πειν᾽, ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω, ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα συνέρχησθε, where the words in brackets should be omitted from the text. The English rendering corresponding to this is, "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup; for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh *damnation* to himself, not *discerning* the Lord's body. . . . For if we would *judge* ourselves, we should not be *judged*. But when we are *judged*, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be *condemned* with the world. . . . If any man hunger, let him eat at home, that ye come not together unto *condemnation*." Here the faults are manifold. In the *first* place, κρίμα is rendered by two separate words, "damnation" and "condemnation;" and, though we can not fairly charge our translators with the inferences practically drawn from the first word, yet this is a blemish which we would gladly remove. But, in fact, both words are equally wrong, the correct rendering "judgment" having in either case been relegated to the margin, where it has lain neglected, and has exercised no influence at all on the popular mind. And this circumstance (for it is only a sample of the fate which has befallen numberless valuable marginal readings elsewhere) suggests an important practical consideration. If the marginal renderings are intended for English-reading people (and for scholars they are superfluous), they will only then fulfill their purpose when the margin is regarded as an integral portion of our English Bibles, and when it is ordered by authority that these alternative readings shall always be printed with the text. This, then, is the *second* error of our translators: κρίνειν, κατακρίνειν, are confused, when the force of the passage depends on their being kept separate; for these κρίματα in the apostle's language are *temporary* judgments, differing so entirely from κατάκριμα that they are intended to have a chastening effect, and to save from condemnation, as he himself distinctly states: κρινόμενοι δὲ ὑπὸ Κυρίου παιδευόμεθα, ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν. Lastly, the version contains a *third* error in the confusion of κρίνειν and διακρίνειν;

for whereas διακρίνοντες τὸ σῶμα is correctly translated "*discerning* the body of the Lord" at the first occurrence of διακρίνειν, yet when the word appears again it is rendered "judge," to the confusion of the sense: εἰ ἑαυτοὺς διεκρίνομεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐκρινόμεθα, "If we *would judge* ourselves, we should not *be judged*," where it ought to stand, "If we *had discerned* ourselves, we should not *have been judged*." In fact, St. Paul speaks of three stages, marked respectively by διακρίνειν, κρίνειν, and κατακρίνειν. The *first* word expresses the duty of persons before and in communicating: this duty is twofold; they must *discern* themselves and *discern* the Lord's body, that they may understand, and not violate the proper relations between the one and the other. The *second* expresses the immediate consequences which ensue from the neglect of this duty—the *judgments* which are corrective and remedial, but not final. The *third* denotes the final *condemnation*, which only then overtakes a man when the second has failed to reform his character. But this sequence is wholly obliterated in our version. In Rom. xiv., 22, 23, again, where the words occur together, it would have been well to have kept the distinction, though here the confusion is not so fatal to the meaning: "Happy is he that *condemneth* not himself (ὁ μὴ κρίνων ἑαυτὸν) in that thing which he alloweth (ἐν ᾧ δοκιμάζει): and he that *doubteth* (ὁ δὲ διακρινόμενος) is *damned* (κατακέκριται) if he eat, because he eateth not of faith." St. Paul is not satisfied in this case that a man should not condemn himself; he must not even *judge* himself. In other words, the case must be so clear that he has no need to balance conflicting arguments with a view to arriving at a result. Otherwise he should abstain altogether, for his eating is not of faith. Here our translators have rendered διακρινόμενος rightly, but a misgiving appears to have occurred to them, for in the margin they add, "*Or*, discerneth and putteth a difference between meats," which would be the active ὁ διακρίνων. Indeed, an evil destiny would seem to have pursued them throughout when dealing with compounds of κρίνειν, for in another passage (2 Cor. i.,

9) they render *ἀπόκριμα* "sentence," though the correct meaning "answer" is given in the margin.

This neglect of prepositions in compound words is a very frequent fault in our version. In the parable of the wheat and the tares, indeed, though the correct reading describes the sowing in the one case by *σπείρειν*, and in the other by *ἐπισπείρειν* (Matt. xiii., 24, 25), yet no blame can attach to our translators for not observing the distinction, as they had in their text the faulty reading *ἔσπειρε* for *ἐπέσπειρεν*. But elsewhere this excuse can not be pleaded in their behalf. Thus, in the parable of the wedding-feast, there is a striking variation of language between the commission of the master and its execution by the servants, which ought not to have been effaced. The order given is *πορεύεσθε ἐπὶ τὰς διεξόδους τῶν ὁδῶν*, but as regards its fulfillment we read simply *ἐξελθόντες εἰς τὰς ὁδούς* (Matt. xxii., 9, 10). In this change of expression we seem to see a reference to the imperfect work of the human agents as contrasted with the urgent and uncompromising terms of the command, which bade them scour the public thoroughfares, following all their outlets; and certainly it is slovenly work to translate both *τὰς διεξόδους τῶν ὁδῶν* and *τὰς ὁδούς* alone by the same rendering "highways." A similar defect, again, is the obliteration of the distinction between *δαπανᾶν* and *ἐκδαπανᾶν* in 2 Cor. xii., 15, "I will very gladly spend (*δαπανήσω*) and be spent (*ἐκδαπανηθήσομαι*) for you," where "wholly spent" would give the force of the compound. But examples of this kind might be multiplied. Would it not be possible, for instance, to find some rendering which, without any shock to good taste, would yet distinguish between *φιλεῖν* and *καταφιλεῖν* in such passages as Matt. xxvi., 48, 49, *ὃν ἂν φιλήσω αὐτός ἐστιν . . . . καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν*, and Luke vii., 45, 46, *φίλημά μοι οὐκ ἔδωκας, αὕτη δὲ . . . οὐ διέλιπεν καταφιλοῦσα τοὺς πόδας μου*, so as to bring out the extravagance of the treachery in the one case and the depth of the devotion in the other, implied in the strong compound *καταφιλεῖν*?

Hardly less considerable is the injury inflicted on the sense

by failing to observe the different force of prepositions when not compounded. Of this fault one instance must suffice. In 2 Cor. iii., 11, *εἰ γὰρ τὸ καταργούμενον διὰ δόξης, πολλῷ μᾶλλον τὸ μένον ἐν δόξῃ*, "For if that which is done away *was glorious*, much more that which remaineth *is glorious*," the distinction of *διὰ δόξης* and *ἐν δόξῃ* is obliterated, though the change is significant in the original, where the *transitory flush* and the *abiding presence* are distinguished by the change of prepositions, and thus another touch is added to the picture of the contrast between the two dispensations.

Again, how much force is lost by neglecting a change of gender in the English rendering of John i., 11, "He came *to his own* (*εἰς τὰ ἴδια*), and *his own* (*οἱ ἴδιοι*) received him not." Here the distinction in the original between the neuter *τὰ ἴδια* and the masculine *οἱ ἴδιοι* at once recalls the parable in Matt. xxi., 33 seq., in which the vineyard corresponds to *τὰ ἴδια* and the husbandmen to *οἱ ἴδιοι*; but our version makes no distinction between the place and the persons—between "his own home" and "his own people." Doubtless there is a terseness and a strength in the English rendering which no one would willingly sacrifice; but the sense ought to be the first consideration.

Let me pass to an illustration of another kind, where confusion is introduced by the same rendering of different verbs: 1 Cor. xiv., 36, "What, came the word of God out from you? or came it unto you only?" Here there appears to the English reader to be an opposition between *from* and *unto*, and the two interrogatives seem to introduce alternative propositions. The original, however, is *ἢ ἀφ' ὑμῶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθεν ἢ εἰς ὑμᾶς μόνους κατήντησεν*, where the fault of the English Version is twofold; the same word is used in rendering *ἐξῆλθεν* and *κατήντησεν*, and *μόνους* is represented by the ambiguous "only." Thus the emphasis is removed from the pronoun *you* in both clauses to the prepositions, and the two hypotheses are made to appear mutually exclusive. The translation of Tyndale, which was retained even in the Bishops'

Bible, though somewhat harsh, is correct and forcible, "Sprange the worde of God from you? Ether came it unto you only?"*

Much attention has been directed by recent writers to the synonyms of the New Testament. They have pointed out what is lost to the English reader by such confusions as those of *αὐλὴ*, *fold*, and *ποίμνη*, *flock*, in John x., 16, where in our version the same word *fold* stands for both,† though the point of our Lord's teaching depends mainly on the distinction between the many folds and the one flock; of *δοῦλοι* and *διάκονοι*, in the parable of the wedding-feast (Matt. xxii., 1 seq.), both rendered by *servants*, though they have different functions assigned to them, and though they represent two distinct classes of beings—the one human, the other angelic ministers;‡ of *κόφινοι* and *σπυρίδες*, in the miracles of feeding the five thousand and the four thousand respectively—both translated *baskets*—though the words are set over against each other in the evangelic narratives (Matt. xvi., 9, 10; Mark viii., 19, 20), and seem to point to a different nationality of the multitudes in the two cases; of *ζῷα* and *θηρία* in the Apocalypse, both represented by *beasts*, though the one denotes the beings who

* A very important passage, in which the hand of the reviser is needed, may perhaps be noted here. The correct Greek text of Matt. v., 32 is *πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας, ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι, καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ μοιχᾶται*, where our English Version has "Whosoever shall put away his wife saving for the cause of fornication causeth her to *commit adultery*;" and "whosoever shall marry her that is divorced *committeth adultery*." Here the English Version casts equal blame on the woman, thus doing her an injustice, for obviously she is not in the same position with the husband as regards guilt; but the Greek *μοιχευθῆναι* (not *μοιχᾶσθαι*), being a passive verb, implies something quite different. In this instance, however, the fault does not lie at the door of our translators, who, instead of *μοιχευθῆναι*, had the false reading *μοιχᾶσθαι*; but, the correct text being restored, a corresponding change in the English rendering is necessary. Compare also the various reading in Matt. xix., 9.

† Tyndale and Coverdale preserve the distinction of *flock* and *fold*. In the Great Bible it disappears.

‡ Here again the older versions generally preserve the distinction, translating *δοῦλοι*, *διάκονοι*, by "servants," "ministers," respectively. The Rheims Version has "waiters" for *διάκονοι*. In this case the Geneva Bible was the first to obliterate the distinction, which was preserved even in the Bishops'.

worship before the throne of heaven, and the other the monsters whose abode is the abyss beneath. For other instances, and generally for an adequate treatment of this branch of exegesis, I shall be content to refer to the works of Archbishop Trench and others; but the following examples, out of many which might be given, will serve as further illustrations of the subject, which is far from being exhausted.

In John xiii., 23, 25, ἦν δὲ ἀνακείμενος εἷς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ . . . ἀναπεσὼν ἐκεῖνος οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λέγει, "Now there was *leaning on* Jesus' bosom one of his disciples . . . He then *lying on* Jesus' breast saith," the English Version makes no distinction between the reclining position of the beloved disciple throughout the meal, described by ἀνακείμενος, and the sudden change of posture at this moment, introduced by ἀναπεσών. This distinction is further enforced in the original by a change in both the prepositions and the nouns, from ἐν to ἐπί, and from κόλπος to στῆθος. St. John was reclining on the bosom of his Master, and he suddenly threw back his head upon his breast to ask a question. Again, in a later passage, a reference occurs—not to the reclining position, but to the sudden movement*—in xxi., 20, ὃς καὶ ἀνέπεσεν ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν, where likewise it is misunderstood by our translators, "which also *leaned on* his breast and said." This is among the most striking of those vivid descriptive traits which distinguish the narrative of the fourth Gospel generally, and which are espe-

* The word ἀναπίπτειν occurs several times in the New Testament, and always signifies a *change* of position, for indeed this idea is inherent in the word. It is used of a rower bending back for a fresh stroke (*e. g.*, Polyb., i., 21, 2), of a horse suddenly checked and rearing (Plat., *Phædr.*, 254 B, E), of a guest throwing himself back on the couch or on the ground preparatory to a meal (Matt. xv., 35; John xiii., 12, etc.).

The received text of xiii., 25 runs, ἐπιπεσὼν δὲ ἐκεῖνος ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος, κ.τ.λ., but the correct reading is as given above. The substitution of ἐπιπεσών, however, does not tell in favor of our translators; for this word ought to have shown, even more clearly than ἀναπεσών, that a *change* of posture was intended. The οὕτως, which appears in the correct text, and gives an additional touch to the picture, has a parallel in iv., 6, ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ. In xxi., 20, there is no various reading.

cially remarkable in these last scenes of Jesus's life, where the beloved disciple was himself an eye-witness and an actor. It is therefore to be regretted that these fine touches of the picture should be blurred in our English Bibles.

Again, in 1 Cor. xiv., 20, *μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν, ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε*, much force is lost by the English rendering, "Be not *children* in understanding; howbeit in malice be ye *children*." In the original St. Paul is not satisfied that his converts should be merely children in vice; they must be something less than this; they must be guileless as *babes;* and we can not afford to obliterate the distinction between *παιδία* and *νήπιοι*. Again, in this same chapter (ver. 7), *ὅμως τὰ ἄψυχα φωνὴν διδόντα . . . ἐὰν διαστολὴν τοῖς φθόγγοις μὴ δῷ* is translated "Even things without life giving *sound* . . . except they give a distinction in the *sounds*," where certainly different words should have been found for *φωνὴ* and *φθόγγος*; and yet our translators did not fail through poverty of expression, for three verses below they have rendered *φωναὶ voices*, and *ἄφωνον without signification*. In the margin they suggest *tunes* for *φθόγγοις*, and this would be preferable to retaining the same word. As *φθόγγος* is used especially of musical sounds, perhaps *notes* might be adopted. This is just a case where a word not elsewhere found in the English Bible might be safely introduced, because there is no incongruity which jars upon the ear. Again, in the following chapter (xv., 40), *ἑτέρα μὲν ἡ τῶν ἐπουρανίων δόξα, ἑτέρα δὲ ἡ τῶν ἐπιγείων. ἄλλη δόξα ἡλίου καὶ ἄλλη δόξα σελήνης καὶ ἄλλη δόξα ἀστέρων*, the words *ἄλλη* and *ἑτέρα* are translated alike, "The glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is *another*. There is one glory of the sun, *another* glory of the moon, and *another* glory of the stars." Yet it is hardly to be doubted that St. Paul purposely uses *ἑτέρα* when he is speaking of things belonging to different classes, as *ἐπουράνια* and *ἐπίγεια*, and *ἄλλη* when he is speaking of things belonging to the same class, as the sun, and moon, and stars; for this is the proper distinction between *ἄλλη* and *ἑτέρα*, that, whereas the former denotes simply dis-

tinction of *individuals*, the latter involves the secondary idea of difference of *kind*. In fact, the change in the form of the sentence by which δόξα, δόξα, from being marked out as the subjects by the definite article and distinguished by μὲν . . . δὲ in the first place, become simply predicates, and are connected by καὶ . . . καὶ in the second, corresponds to the change from ἑτέρα to ἄλλη in passing from the one to the other. These words ἄλλος, ἕτερος, occur together more than once, and in all cases something is lost by effacing the distinction. In Gal. i., 6, θαυμάζω ὅτι οὕτω ταχέως μετατίθεσθε . . . εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο, translated "I marvel that ye are so soon removed . . . unto *another* Gospel which is not *another*," the sense would be brought out by giving each word its proper force; and again, in 2 Cor. xi., 4, ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν κηρύσσει ὃν οὐκ ἐκηρύξαμεν ἢ πνεῦμα ἕτερον λαμβάνετε ὃ οὐκ ἐλάβετε, though the loss is less considerable, the distinction might with advantage have been preserved. In these instances, however, a reviser might be deterred by the extreme difficulty in distinguishing the two, without introducing some modernism. In the passage first quoted (1 Cor. xv., 40), the end might perhaps be attained by simply substituting "other" for "another" in rendering ἑτέρα.

Still more important is it to mark the distinction between εἶναι and γίνεσθαι, where our translators have not observed it. Thus our English rendering of John viii., 58, "Before Abraham *was*, I *am*," loses half the force of the original, πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγώ εἰμι, "Before Abraham *was born*, I *am*." The *becoming* only can be rightly predicated of the patriarch; the *being* is reserved for the Eternal Son alone. Similar in kind, though less in degree, is the loss in the rendering of Luke vi., 36, γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς [καὶ] ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν, "*Be* ye merciful, as your Father also *is* merciful." Here also the original expresses the distinction between the imperfect effort and the eternal attribute.*

* In 1 Pet. i., 16, our translators, when they gave the rendering "*Be* ye holy, for I *am* holy," had before them the reading ἅγιοι γένεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιός εἰμι, but the correct text is ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος (omitting εἰμί).

Illustrations of similar defects might be multiplied, though in many cases it is much easier to point out the fault than to suggest the remedy. Thus such a rendering as 2 Cor. vii., 10, "For godly sorrow worketh *repentance* (*μετάνοιαν*) to salvation not to be *repented of* (*ἀμεταμέλητον*)," belongs to this class. Here the Geneva Testament has "causeth amendment unto salvation not to be repented of," and perhaps it were best, in this instance, to sacrifice the usual rendering of *μετάνοια* in order to preserve the distinction (unless, indeed, we are prepared to introduce the word "regret" for *μεταμέλεια*), especially as *μεταμέλεσθαι* in the context is consistently translated "repent." Again, it were desirable to find some better rendering of *πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον* in James i., 17, than "every good *gift* and every perfect *gift*," since a contemporary of St. James especially distinguishes *δόσις, δόμα*, from *δῶρον, δωρεὰ*, etc., saying that the latter are much stronger, and involve the idea of magnitude and fullness, which is wanting to the former (Philo, *Leg. All.*, iii., 70, p. 126, *ἔμφασιν μεγέθους τελείων ἀγαθῶν δηλοῦσιν, κ.τ.λ.*; comp. *de Cherub.*, 23, p. 154), and applying to them the very same epithet "perfect" which occurs in the passage before us. And yet the distinction would be dearly purchased at the cost of an offensive Latinism. But, whatever difficulty there may be in finding different renderings here, it was certainly not necessary in the sentence immediately preceding, "When lust hath conceived, it *bringeth forth* sin; and sin, when it is finished, *bringeth forth* death," *ἡ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν, ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα ἀποκύει θάνατον*, either to obliterate a real distinction by giving the same rendering of *τίκτει* and *ἀποκύει*, or to create an artificial distinction by adopting different forms of sentences for *ἡ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα* and *ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα*. The English might run, "Lust, when it hath conceived, bringeth forth sin, and sin, when it is perfected (or "grown"), gendereth death." Again, in Rom. xii., 2, "Be not *conformed* to this world, but be ye *transformed* by the renewing of your mind," for *μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ ἀλλὰ*

*μεταμορφοῦσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοὸς* [*ὑμῶν*], the English not only suggests an identity of expression which has no place in the original, but obliterates an important distinction between the *σχῆμα*, or *fashion*, and the *μορφὴ*, or *form*—between the outward and transitory, and the abiding and substantial. We might translate *μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε*, *κ.τ.λ.*, "Be ye not fashioned after this world, but be ye transformed in the renewing, etc.," thus partially retracing our steps, and following on the track of Tyndale's and other earlier versions, which have "Fashion not yourselves like unto this world," and so preserve the distinction of *σχῆμα* and *μορφὴ* (though they are not very happy in their rendering of *μεταμορφοῦσθε*, "Be ye changed in your *shape*)." In this instance our translators have followed the guidance of Wicliffe and the Rheims Version, which have *conformed* and *reformed*. In another passage, Phil., ii., 6 seq., where the distinction of *μορφὴ* and *σχῆμα* is still more important, it is happily preserved in our Authorized Version: "Being in the *form* of God," "took upon him the *form* of a servant," "being found in *fashion* as a man."

In other cases, where it is even more important for the sense to observe the distinction of synonyms, we seem to have no choice but to acquiesce in the confusion. At an earlier stage of the language it might have been possible to establish different renderings, but now the English equivalents are so stereotyped that any change seems impossible. Thus the rendering of *διάβολος* and *δαιμόνιον* by the same word "devil" is a grievous loss; and it is much to be regretted that Wicliffe's translation of *δαιμόνιον* by "fiend" was not adopted by Tyndale, in which case it would probably have become the current rendering. Now the sense of incongruity would make its adoption impossible. Still greater misunderstanding arises from translating *Hades* the place of departed spirits, and *Gehenna* the place of fire and torment, by the same word "hell," and thus confusing two ideas wholly distinct. In such a passage as Acts ii., 27, 31, the misconception thus created is very serious. Is it possible even now to naturalize

the word *Hades*, and give it a place in our version, or must we be satisfied with pointing out in the margin in each case whether the word "hell" represents *Hades* or *Gehenna?* Another, though a less important instance, is the word "temple," which represents both ναός, the inner shrine or sanctuary, and ἱερόν, the whole of the sacred precincts. Thus, in the English Version, an utter confusion of localities results from a combination of two such passages as Matt. xxiii., 35, "Whom ye slew between the temple (τοῦ ναοῦ) and the altar," and Matt. xxi., 12, "Them that sold and bought in the temple" (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ). In the first case, for τοῦ ναοῦ St. Luke (xi., 51) uses τοῦ οἴκου, "the house," the building which is, as it were, the abode of the divine presence; but our English translators have boldly rendered even τοῦ οἴκου by "the temple." More hopeless still is it to preserve the distinction between θυσιαστήριον, the Jewish, and βωμός, the heathen altar, the latter word occurring only once in the New Testament (Acts xvii., 23), and the poverty of our language obliging us there to translate it by the same word as θυσιαστήριον.

The contrast of Jew and Gentile involved in these last words recalls another pair of synonyms, which present the same relation to each other, and in which the distinction is equally impracticable — λαός, used especially of the chosen people and in contradistinction to the Gentiles (e.g., Acts iv., 25, 27; x., 2; xxi., 28; Rom. ix., 25, 26; 1 Pet. ii., 10, etc.), and δῆμος, denoting the people of a heathen city, and more particularly when gathered together in the popular assembly (e.g., at Cæsarea, Acts xii., 22;* at Thessalonica, Acts xvii., 5; at Ephesus, Acts xix., 30, 33).

* A heathen multitude, such as would naturally be found in a city which was the seat of the Roman government, is contemplated here, as the whole incident shows. Hence Tyndale and the later versions rightly translate θεοῦ φωνὴ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπου (ver. 22), "The voice of *a* god and not of *a* man," where Wicliffe has "The voice of God and not of man." When the *Jews* of Cæsarea are especially intended, ὁ λαὸς is used instead of ὁ δῆμος: Acts x., 2.

§ 4.

Another class of errors, far more numerous and much more easily corrected than the last, is due to the imperfect knowledge of Greek *grammar* in the age in which our translators lived. And here it is instructive to observe how their accuracy fails for the most part just at the point where the Latin language ceases to run parallel with the Greek. In two remarkable instances, at all events, this is the case. The Latin language has only one past tense where the Greek has two; a Roman was forced to translate ἐλάλησα and λελάληκα by the same expression "locutus sum." Accordingly, we find that our English translators make no difference between the aorist and the perfect, apparently giving the most *obvious* rendering on each occasion, and not being guided by any grammatical principle in the treatment of these tenses. Again, the Latin language has no definite article, and correspondingly, in our English Version, its presence or absence is almost wholly disregarded. Indeed, it would hardly be an exaggeration to say that, if the translators had been left to supply or omit the definite article in every case according to the probabilities of the sense or the requirements of the English, without any aid from the Greek, the result would have been about as accurate as it is at present.

I am not bringing any charge against the ability of our translators. To demand from them a knowledge of Greek Grammar which their age did not possess would be to demand an impossibility. Accustomed to write and to speak in Latin, they unconsciously limited the range and capacity of the Greek by the measure of the classical language with which they were most familiarly acquainted. But our own more accurate knowledge may well be brought to bear to correct these deficiencies. Tyndale had said truly that "the Greek tongue agreeth more with the English than the Latin;" and it should be our endeavor to avail ourselves of this agreement, and so to reproduce the meaning of the original

with greater exactness. I hope to show, before I have done, that it is no mere pedantic affectation which would prompt us to correct these faults, but that important interests, sometimes doctrinal, sometimes historical, are involved in their adjustment.

1. Under the head of faulty grammar, the *tenses* deserve to be considered first. And here I will begin with the defect on which I have already touched—the confusion of the *aorist* and the *perfect*. It is not meant to assert that the aorist can always be rendered by an aorist and the perfect by a perfect in English.* No two languages coincide exactly in usage, and allowance must be made for the difference. But still I think it will be seen that our version may be greatly improved in this respect without violence to the English idiom.

Thus, in John i., 3, *χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν*, or in 2 Cor. xii., 17, 18, *μή τινα ὧν ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐπλεονέκτησα ὑμᾶς; παρεκάλεσα Τίτον καὶ συναπέστειλα τὸν ἀδελφόν*, or in Col. i., 16, 17, *ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα . . . . τὰ πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται*, is there any reason why the tenses should not have been preserved, so that the distinction between the historical fact and the permanent result would have appeared in all three cases? Yet our translators have rendered *ἐγένετο, γέγονεν* equally by "were made" in the first passage, *ἀπέσταλκα, ἀπέστειλα* by "I sent" in the second, and *ἐκτίσθη, ἔκτισται* by "were created" in the third. Again, in 1 John iv., 9, 10, 14, *ἀπέσταλκεν, ἀπέστειλεν, ἀπέσταλκεν*, are all rendered in an aoristic sense "he sent," though the appropriateness of either tense in its own context is sufficiently noticeable. On the other hand, in an exactly parallel case, 1 Cor. ix., 22, *ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἀσθένεσιν ἀσθενὴς ἵνα τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς κερδήσω· τοῖς πᾶσιν γέγονα πάντα*, where in like manner the aorist gives an isolated past incident, and the perfect sums up the total present result, the distinction of tenses is happily preserved,

* A comparison of English with the languages of Continental Europe will illustrate the difference of idiom in this respect.

"To the weak *became* I weak, that I might gain the weak: I *am made* all things to all men:" though "I *am become*" would have been preferable, as preserving the same verb in both cases. But I fear that this correct rendering must be ascribed to accident; for the haphazard way in which these tenses are treated will appear as well from the instances already quoted as from such a passage as 2 Cor. vii., 13, 14: "Therefore we were comforted (παρακεκλήμεθα) in your comfort, yea, and exceedingly the more joyed we (ἐχάρημεν) for the joy of Titus, because his spirit was refreshed (ἀναπέπαυται) by you all. For if I have boasted (κεκαύχημαι) any thing to him of you, I am not ashamed (κατῃσχύνθην), but as we speak (ἐλαλήσαμεν) all things to you in truth, even so our boasting which I made before Titus ([ἡ] ἐπὶ Τίτου) is found (ἐγενήθη) a truth."

Such passages as these bring out this weakness of our translation the more strikingly because the tenses appear in juxtaposition. But it is elsewhere that the most serious injury is inflicted on the sense. I will give examples of the *aorist* first, and I hope to make it clear that more than the interests of exact scholarship are concerned in the accurate rendering.

If I read St.Paul aright, the correct understanding of whole paragraphs depends on the retention of the aoristic sense, and the substitution of a perfect confuses his meaning, obliterating the main idea, and introducing other conceptions which are alien to the passages. As illustrations of this, take two passages, Rom. vi., 1 seq.; Col. ii., 11 seq. In the first passage, ἀπεθάνομεν (ver. 2), ἐβαπτίσθημεν (ver. 3), συνετάφημεν (ver. 4), συνεσταυρώθη (ver. 6), ἀπεθάνομεν (ver. 8), ὑπηκούσατε (ver. 17), ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ (ver. 18), ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, δουλωθέντες τῷ Θεῷ (ver. 22), ἐθανατώθητε (vii., 4), κατηργήθημεν, ἀποθανόντες (ver. 6). In the second passage, περιετμήθητε (ii., 11), συνταφέντες, συνηγέρθητε (ver. 12), συνεζωοποίησεν (ver. 13), ἐδειγμάτισεν (ver. 15), ἀπεθάνετε (ver. 20), συνηγέρθητε (iii., 1), ἀπεθάνετε (ver. 3). Now the consistency with which St.Paul uses the aorist in these two doctrinal passages which treat of the same subject (scarcely ever interposing a perfect, and then

only for exceptional reasons which are easily intelligible) is very remarkable: "Ye died, ye were buried, ye were raised, ye were made alive;" and the argument might be very much strengthened by reference to other passages where the apostle prefers the aorist in treating of the same topics.* In short, St. Paul regards this change—from sin to righteousness, from bondage to freedom, from death to life—as summed up in one definite act of the past; potentially to all men in our Lord's Passion and Resurrection, actually to each individual man when he accepts Christ, is baptized into Christ. Then he is made righteous by being incorporated into Christ's righteousness, he dies once for all to sin, he lives henceforth forever to God. This is the *ideal*. Practically we know that the death to sin and the life to righteousness are inchoate, imperfect, gradual, meagerly realized even by the most saintly of men in this life; but St. Paul sets the matter in this ideal light to force upon the consciences of his hearers the fact that an entire change came over them when they became Christians, that the knowledge and the grace then vouchsafed to them did not leave them where they were, that they are not, and can not be their former selves, and that it is a contradiction of their very being to sin any more. It is the definiteness, the absoluteness of this change, considered as a historical crisis, which forms the central idea of St. Paul's teaching, and which the aorist marks. We can not, therefore, afford to obscure this idea by disregarding the distinctions of grammar. Yet in our English Version it is a mere chance whether in such cases the aorist is translated as an aorist.

The misconception which arises from this neglect of the aorist has vitally affected the interpretation of one passage. In 2 Cor. v., 14, "If one died for all, then *were* all *dead*" ([εἰ] εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον), our version sub-

* For instance, Gal. ii., 16, 17, 18, 19, 21; iii., 3, 27; v. 13, 24 (οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν); Ephes. i., 11, 13; ii., 5, 6 (συνεζωοποίησεν, συνήγειρεν, συνεκάθισεν), 13, 14; iv., 1, 4, 7, 30 (ἐσφραγίσθητε); Col. i., 13 (ἐρρύσατο, μετέστησεν); iii., 15; 2 Tim. i., 7, 9; Tit. iii., 5 (ἔσωσεν): see also 1 Pet. i., 3, 18; ii., 21; iii., 9.

stitutes the state of death for the fact of dying, and thus interprets the death to be a death *through sin* instead of a death *to sin*. The reference in the context to the old things passing away, and the language of St. Paul elsewhere, *e. g.*, Rom. vi., 2, 8; viii., 6; Col. ii., 20; iii., 3, already quoted, seem to show that the true sense is what would naturally be suggested by the correct rendering of the aorist; that all men have participated potentially in Christ's death, have died with him to their former selves and to sin, and are therefore bound to lead a new life.*

Not very unlike the passages which I have been considering is Acts xix., 2, εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐλάβετε πιστεύσαντες, which our translators give "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" It should run, "Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?" for the aorist of πιστεύειν is used very commonly, not of the continuous state of belief, but of the definite act of accepting the faith; *e. g.*, Acts xi., 17; Rom. xiii., 11; 1 Cor. iii., 5; xv., 2; Gal. ii., 7, etc.

The instances which have been given hitherto more or less directly affect *doctrine*. In the two next examples, which occur in quotations from the Old Testament, a *historical* connection is severed by the mistranslation of the aorist. In Matt. ii., 15, ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου is rendered "Out of Egypt *have I called* my son;" but, turning to the original passage in Hosea (xi., 1), we find that the proper aoristic sense must be restored: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and *called* my son out of Egypt." Again, in 2 Cor. iv., 13, ἐπίστευσα διὸ ἐλάλησα is given "I believed, and therefore *have I spoken*," a rendering unsuited to its position in the LXX. of Psa. cxvi., 10 (cxv., 1) whence it is quoted.

* The only passages which would seem to favor the other interpretation are 1 Cor. xv., 22, ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν, and Rom. v., 15, εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον. Yet, even if this interpretation were adopted, the aoristic sense of ἀπέθανον ought to be preserved, because the potential death of all men in Adam corresponds to the potential life of all men in Christ, and is regarded as having been effected once for all in Adam's transgression, as in Rom. v., 15.

Such examples as these, however, are very far from exhausting the subject. In one passage the aorist κτήσασθαι is treated as if κεκτῆσθαι, and rendered "possess" instead of "acquire," in defiance of a distinction which it does not require the erudition of Lord Macaulay's school-boy to appreciate: Luke xxi., 19, ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσασθε [l. κτήσεσθε] τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, "In your patience *possess* ye your souls." Errors, however, occur also in this same word in 1 Thess. iv., 4, where the present is similarly treated, εἰδέναι ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκεῦος κτᾶσθαι ἐν ἁγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ, "that every one of you should know how to *possess* his vessel in sanctification and honor;" and again, in Luke xviii., 12, where ὅσα κτῶμαι is translated "all that I *possess*;" and thus it seems probable that the mistake first arose from a misapprehension of the meaning of κτᾶσθαι rather than from a direct confusion of tenses. Yet even so this very misapprehension must have been owing to the inability to see how the sense "possess" is derived from the proper force of the perfect.*

The treatment of the *perfect* is almost equally faulty with the treatment of the aorist. Thus, in 1 Cor. xv., 4 seq., St. Paul lays the stress of his argument on the fact that Christ *is risen*. This perfect ἐγήγερται is repeated six times within a few verses (ver. 4, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20), while the aorist ἠγέρθη is not once used. The point is not that Christ *once rose from the grave*, but that, having risen, *he lives forever*, as a first-fruit or earnest of the resurrection. Indeed, the contrast between the tenses ὅτι ἐτάφη καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται (ver. 4) throws out this idea in still stronger relief. In the 13th and following verses this conception becomes so patent on the face of St. Paul's language that our translators could not fail to see it, and ac-

* In Matt. x., 9, μὴ κτήσησθε χρυσόν, the older versions generally render κτήσησθε by "possess," for which the A. V. substitutes "provide," with the marginal alternative "get;" and in Acts i., 18, ἐκτήσατο χωρίον, the oldest versions have "hath possessed," for which the A.V. (after the Bishops' and Geneva Bibles) substitutes "purchased." These facts seem to show that the proper distinction between κτᾶσθαι and κεκτῆσθαι (which latter does not occur in the New Testament) was beginning to dawn upon Biblical scholars.

cordingly from this point onward the perfect is correctly translated; but the fact that in the two earliest instances where it occurs (ver. 4, 12), *ἐγήγερται* is treated as an aorist, "he rose," shows that they did not regard the rules of grammar, but were guided only by the apparent demands of the sense. Another example, closely allied to the last, occurs in Heb. vii., 14, 22. The context lays stress on the *unchangeable* priesthood: "Thou art a priest forever," "He continueth ever" (ver. 21, 24). Hence, in ver. 14, the writer says, *πρόδηλον ὅτι ἐξ Ἰούδα ἀνατέταλκεν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν*, and in ver. 22, *κατὰ τοσοῦτο καὶ κρείττονος διαθήκης γέγονεν ἔγγυος Ἰησοῦς*. But these references to present existence are obliterated in the A.V., which substitutes aorists in both cases, "Our Lord *sprang* out of Juda," "*was* Jesus *made* a surety."

These instances have a more or less direct *doctrinal* bearing. The examples which shall be given next are important in a *historical* aspect. In the passage (2 Cor. xii., 2 seq.) in which St. Paul describes the visions vouchsafed to one "caught up to the third heaven," it can hardly be doubted that he refers to himself. This appears not only from the connection of the context, but also (in the original) from the mode of expression, *οἶδα ἄνθρωπον, οἶδα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἄνθρωπον*. I have already pointed out (p. 50) the capricious variations in the renderings of *οἶδα, οἶδεν*, in the context of this passage. But in these two clauses our translators are not only capricious, but absolutely wrong, for they give to *οἶδα* an aoristic sense which it can not possibly have, "I *knew* a man," "I *knew* such a man," thus disconnecting the actual speaker from the object of the vision, and suggesting to the English reader the idea that the apostle is speaking of some past acquaintance.

Again, St. Matthew, in three several passages (i., 22; xxi., 4; xxvi., 56), introduces a reference to prophecies in the Old Testament which have had their fulfillment in incidents of the Gospel history by the words *τοῦτο δὲ [ὅλον] γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ* (or *ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν*), κ.τ.λ. In all three passages, it will be observed, the evangelist has the perfect *γέγονεν*, "*is come*

to pass;" and in all three our English Version gives it as an aorist, "*was* done." Now it can not be urged (as it might with some plausibility in the case of the Apocalypse) that St. Matthew is careless about the use of the aorist and the perfect, or that he has any special fondness for γέγονεν. On the contrary, though the aorist (ἐγένετο, γενέσθαι, etc.) frequently occurs in this Gospel, there are not many examples of the perfect γέγονεν; and in almost every instance our version is faulty. In xix., 8, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς οὐ γέγονεν οὕτως, the aoristic rendering, "From the beginning it *was not* so," entirely misleads the English reader as to the sense; in xxiv., 21, οἵα οὐ γέγονεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, "Such as *hath not been* from the beginning," would (I suppose) be universally accepted as an improvement on the present translation, "Such as *was not* from the beginning;" and lastly, in xxv., 6, κραυγὴ γέγονεν, the startling effect of the sudden surprise is expressed by the change of tense from the aorist, "a cry *is raised*," and ought not to be neglected. When, therefore, this evangelist in three distinct places introduces the fulfillment of a prophecy by γέγονεν, the fact can not be without meaning. In two of these passages editors sometimes attach the τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν to the words of the previous speaker — of the angel in i., 22, and of our Lord in xxvi., 56—in order to explain the perfect. But this connection is very awkward even in these two cases, and wholly out of the question in the remaining instance (xxi., 4). Is not the true solution this: that these tenses preserve the freshness of the earliest catechetical narrative of the Gospel history, when the narrator was not so far removed from the fact that it was unnatural for him to say "This *is* come to pass?" I find this hypothesis confirmed when I turn to the Gospel of St. John. He, too, adopts a nearly identical form of words on one occasion to introduce a prophecy, but with a significant change of tense: xix., 36, ἐγένετο γὰρ ταῦτα ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ. To one writing at the close of the century, the events of the Lord's life would appear as a historic past; and so the γέγονεν of the earlier evangelist is exchanged for the ἐγένετο of the later.

An able American writer on the English language, criticising a previous effort at revision, remarks somewhat satirically that, judging from this revised version, the tenses "are coming to have in England a force which they have not now in America."* Now I have already conceded that allowance must be made from time to time for difference of idiom in rendering aorists and perfects, and I do not know to what passages in the revision issued by the Five Clergymen this criticism is intended to apply. But it is important that our new revisers should not defer hastily to such authority, and close too eagerly with a license which may be abused. The fact is, that our judgment in this matter is apt to be misled by two disturbing influences: we must be on our guard alike against the *idola fori* and against the *idola specus*.

*First*, the language of the Authorized Version is so wrought into the fabric of our minds by long habit, that the corresponding conception is firmly lodged there also. Thus it happens that when a change of words is offered to us, we unconsciously apply the new words to the old conception, and are dissatisfied with them because they seem incongruous; and perhaps we conclude that English idiom is violated because they do not mean what we expect them to mean, not being prepared to make the necessary effort required to master the new conception involved in them. *Idola fori omnium molestissima sunt quæ ex fœdere verborum et nominum se insinuarunt in intellectum.*

But, *secondly*, the idols of our cave are scarcely less misleading than the idols of the market-place. Living in the middle of the nineteenth century, we can not, without an effort, transfer ourselves to the modes of thought and of language which were common in the first. The mistranslation from which this digression started affords a good instance of

* Marsh's *Lectures on the English Language*, No. xxviii., p. 633, speaking of the translation of St. John by the Five Clergymen. The passage is quoted by Bp. Ellicott (*Revision of the English New Testament*, p. 20), who seems half disposed to acquiesce in the justice of the criticism.

this source of misapprehension. We should not ourselves say "This *is come* to pass" in referring to facts which happened more than eighteen centuries ago, and therefore we oblige the eye-witnesses to hold our own language, and say "This *came* to pass."

From the perfect tense I pass on to the *present*. And here I find a still better illustration of the errors into which we are led by following the *idola specus*. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the sacred writer, when speaking of the Temple services and the Mosaic ritual, habitually uses the present tense: *e.g.*, ix., 6, 7, 9, εἰσίασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς, προσφέρει ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ, ἅ τε καὶ θυσίαι προσφέρονται; x., 1, θυσίαις ἃς προσφέρουσιν. Now I do not say that this is absolutely conclusive as showing that the epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, but it is certainly a valuable indication of an early date, and should not have been obliterated. Yet our translators in such cases almost invariably substitute a past tense, as in the passages just quoted, "the priests *went* in," "he *offered* for himself," "*were* offered both gifts and sacrifices," "sacrifices which they *offered*." And similarly, in ix., 18, they render ἐγκεκαίνισται "*was* dedicated," and in ix., 9, τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεστηκότα, "the time *then* present." Only in very rare instances do they allow the present to stand, and for the most part in such cases alone where it has no direct historical bearing. The Temple worship was a thing of the remote past to themselves in the seventeenth century, and they forced the writer of the epistle to speak their own language.

Another and a more important example of the present tense is the rendering of οἱ σωζόμενοι. In the language of the New Testament salvation is a thing of the past, a thing of the present, and a thing of the future. St. Paul says sometimes "Ye (or we) were saved" (Rom. viii., 24), or "Ye have been saved" (Ephes. ii., 5, 8); sometimes "Ye are being saved" (1 Cor. xv., 2), and sometimes "Ye shall be saved" (Rom. x., 9, 13). It is important to observe this, because we are thus taught that σωτηρία involves a moral condition which must

have begun already, though it will receive its final accomplishment hereafter. Godliness, righteousness, is life, is salvation. And it is hardly necessary to say that the divorce of morality and religion must be fostered and encouraged by failing to note this, and so laying the whole stress either on the past or on the future—on the *first call* or on the *final change.* It is therefore important that the idea of salvation as a rescue from sin through the knowledge of God in Christ, and therefore a progressive condition, a present state, should not be obscured; and we can not but regret such a translation as Acts ii., 47, "The Lord added to the Church daily such as *should be saved*, where the Greek *τοὺς σωζομένους* implies a different idea. In other passages, Luke xiii., 23; 1 Cor. i., 18; 2 Cor. ii., 15; Rev. xxi., 24 (omitted in some texts), where *οἱ σωζόμενοι* occurs, the renderings "be saved, are saved" may perhaps be excused by the requirements of the English language, though these again suggest rather a complete act than a continuous and progressive state.

In other cases the substitution of a past tense inflicts a slighter, but still a perceptible injury. It obscures the vividness of the narrative or destroys the relation of the sentences. Thus, in Matt. iii., 1, 13, the appearing of John the Baptist and of our Lord are introduced in the same language: *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις παραγίνεται Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής*, and *τότε παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς*. It is a misfortune that we are obliged to translate the expression *παραγίνεται* by the very ordinary word "come;" but the English Version, by rendering the first sentence "In those days *came* John," while it gives the second correctly, "Then *cometh* Jesus," quite unnecessarily impairs both the vigor and the parallelism of the narrative. Exactly similar to this last instance is another in St. Luke vii., 33, 34, *ἐλήλυθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής . . . ἐλήλυθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, where again the first *ἐλήλυθεν* is translated *came*, the second *is come.*

In rendering *imperfect* tenses, it is for the most part impossible to give the full sense without encumbering the En-

glish idiom unpleasantly. But in exceptional usages, as, for instance, where the imperfect has the inchoate, *tentative* force, its meaning can be preserved without any such sacrifice, and ought not to be obliterated. Thus, in Luke i., 59, *ἐκάλουν αὐτό Ζαχαρίαν* is not "They called it (the child) Zacharias," but "They *were for calling* it," "They *would have called* it." Closely allied to this is the *conditional* sense of the imperfect, which again our English translators have rendered inadequately or not at all. Thus, in Gal. iv., 20, *ἤθελον δὲ παρεῖναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἄρτι* is not "I *desire* to be present with you now," as our translators have it, but "I *could have* desired;" and in Matt. iii., 14, *ὁ Ἰωάννης διεκώλυεν αὐτόν* is not "John *forbade* him," but "John *would have hindered* him." Again, in Rom. ix., 3, *ηὐχόμην γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, the moral difficulty disappears when the words are correctly translated, not, as the English Version, "I *could* wish that myself were accursed for Christ," but "I *could have* wished," etc.; because the imperfect itself implies that it is impossible to entertain such a wish, things being what they are. Again, in Acts xxv., 22, *ἐβουλόμην καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀκοῦσαι*, the language of Agrippa is much more courteous and delicate than our English version represents it. He does not say "I *would* also *hear* the man myself," but "I myself also *could have wished to hear* the man," if the favor had not been too great to ask. Elsewhere our version is more accurate, e. g., Acts vii., 26, *συνήλλασσεν αὐτοὺς εἰς εἰρήνην*, "*would have* set them at one again."*

2. If the rendering of the tenses affords wide scope for improvement, this is equally the case with the treatment of the *definite article.* And here again I think it will be seen that theology is almost as deeply concerned as scholarship in the correction of errors. In illustration, let me refer to the passage which the great authority of Bentley brought into prom-

* Here, however, our translators appear to have read *συνήλασεν*, so that their accuracy is purely accidental.

inence, and which has often been adduced since his time. In Rom. v., 15–19, there is a sustained contrast between "*the* one (ὁ εἷς)" and "*the* many (*οἱ πολλοί*);" but in the English Version the definite article is systematically omitted: "If, through the offense of *one*, *many* be dead," and so throughout the passage, closing with, "For as by *one man's* disobedience *many* were made sinners, so by the obedience of *one* shall *many* be made righteous." In place of any comment of my own, I will quote Bentley's words. Pleading for the correct rendering, he says: "By this accurate version some hurtful mistakes about partial redemption and absolute reprobation had been happily prevented. Our English readers had then seen, what several of the fathers saw and testified, that *οἱ πολλοὶ*, *the many*, in an antithesis to *the one*, are equivalent to *πάντες*, *all*, in ver. 12, and comprehend the whole multitude, the entire species of mankind, exclusive only of *the one*."* In other words, the benefits of Christ's obedience extend to all men potentially. It is only human self-will which places limits to its operation.

Taken in connection with a previous illustration (p. 82 seq.), this second example from the Epistle to the Romans will enable us to estimate the amount of injury which is inflicted on St. Paul's argument by grammatical inaccuracies. Both the two great lines of doctrinal teaching respecting the Redemption, which run through this epistle—the one relating to the *mode of its operation*, the other to the *extent of its application*—are more or less misrepresented in our English Version owing to this cause. The former is obscured, as we saw, by a confusion of tenses, while the latter is distorted by a disregard of the definite article.

This, however, is the usual manner of treating the article when connected with *πολλοὶ* and similar words; e. g., Matt. xxiv., 12, "The love of *many* shall wax cold," where the picture in the original is much darker; *τῶν πολλῶν*, "the many," the vast majority of the disciples; or again, Phil. i., 14, "And

* Bentley's *Works*, iii., p. 244 (ed. Dyce).

*many* of the brethren in the Lord waxing confident," where the error is even greater, for St. Paul distinctly writes τοὺς πλείονας, "the greater part." Similarly, also, it is neglected before λοιπός: e.g., Luke xxiv., 10, "And other women that were with them" (αἱ λοιπαὶ σὺν αὐταῖς); 1 Cor. ix., 4, "To lead about a sister, a wife, as well as *other* apostles" (ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι); 2 Cor. xii., 13, "Ye were inferior to other churches" (τὰς λοιπὰς ἐκκλησίας); in all which passages historical facts are obscured or perverted by the neglect of the article. And again, in 2 Cor. ii., 6, where ἡ ἐπιτιμία ἡ ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων is rendered "this punishment which was inflicted of *many*," the conception of a regular judicial assembly, in which the penalty is decided by the vote of *the majority*, disappears.

Nor is the passage quoted by Bentley the only example in which the broad features of St. Paul's teaching suffer from an indifference to the presence or the absence of the definite article. The distinction between νόμος and ὁ νόμος is very commonly disregarded, and yet it is full of significance. Behind the concrete representation—the Mosaic law itself—St. Paul sees an imperious principle, an overwhelming presence, antagonistic to grace, to liberty, to spirit, and (in some aspects) even to life—abstract law, which, though the Mosaic ordinances are its most signal and complete embodiment, nevertheless is not exhausted therein, but exerts its crushing power over the conscience in diverse manifestations. The one—the concrete and special—is ὁ νόμος; the other—the abstract and universal—is νόμος. To the full understanding of such passages as Rom. ii., 12 seq.; iii., 19 seq.; iv., 13 seq.; vii., 1 seq.; Gal. iii., 10 seq.; and, indeed, to an adequate conception of the leading idea of St. Paul's doctrine of law and grace, this distinction is indispensable.

The Gospels, again, will furnish illustrations of a somewhat different kind. To us "Christ" has become a proper name, and, as such, rejects the definite article. But in the Gospel narratives, if we except the headings or prefaces, and the after-comments of the evangelists themselves (e.g., Matt. i., 1;

Mark i., 1; John i., 17), no instance of this usage can be found. In the body of the narratives we read only of ὁ Χριστός, *the* Christ, *the* Messiah, whom the Jews had long expected, and who might or might not be identified with the person "Jesus," according to the spiritual discernment of the individual. Χριστὸς is nowhere connected with Ἰησοῦς in the Gospels with the exception of John xvii., 3, where it occurs in a prophetic declaration of our Lord, ἵνα γινώσκωσιν τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν; nor is it used without the definite article in more than four passages, Mark ix., 41, ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ; Luke ii., 11, σωτὴρ ὅς ἐστιν Χριστὸς Κύριος; xxiii., 2, λέγοντα ἑαυτὸν Χριστόν; John ix., 22, αὐτὸν ὁμολογήσῃ Χριστόν, where the very exceptions strengthen the rule. The turning-point is the Resurrection: then, and not till then, we hear of "Jesus Christ" from the lips of contemporary speakers (Acts ii., 38; iii., 6), and from that time forward Christ begins to be used as a proper name, with or without the article. This fact points to a rule which should be strictly observed in translation. In the Gospel narratives ὁ Χριστὸς should always be rendered "*the* Christ," and never "Christ" simply. In some places our translators have observed this (e.g., Matt. xxvi., 63; Mark viii., 29), and occasionally they have even overdone the translation, rendering ὁ Χριστὸς by "*that* Christ," John i., 25, [vi., 69], or "*the very* Christ," John vii., 26; but elsewhere, under exactly the same conditions, the article is omitted, e.g., Matt. xvi., 16; xxiv., 5; Luke xxiii., 35, 39, etc. Yet the advantage of recognizing its presence even in extreme cases, where at first sight it seems intrusive, would be great. In such an instance as that of Herod's inquiry, Matt. ii., 4, ποῦ ὁ Χριστὸς γεννᾶται, "Where Christ should be born," probably all would acknowledge the advantage of substituting "*the* Christ;" but would not the true significance of other passages, where the meaning is less obvious, be restored by the change? Thus, in Matt. xi., 2, ὁ δὲ Ἰωάνης ἀκούσας ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the evangelist's meaning is not that the Baptist heard what Jesus was doing, but

that he was informed of one performing those works of mercy and power which the evangelic prophet had foretold as the special function of the Messiah.* I have studiously confined the rigid application of this rule to the historical portions of the Gospels, and excepted the evangelists' own prefaces and comments; but even in these latter a passage is occasionally brought out with much greater force by understanding τὸν Χριστὸν to apply to the office rather than the individual, and translating it "*the* Christ." In the genealogy of St. Matthew, for instance, where the generations are divided symmetrically into three sets of fourteen, the evangelist seems to connect the last of each set with a critical epoch in the history of Israel; the first reaching from the origin of the race to the commencement of the monarchy (ver. 6, "David *the king*"); the second from the commencement of the monarchy to the captivity in Babylon; the third and last from the captivity to the coming of the Messiah, *the* Christ (ἕως τοῦ Χριστοῦ). Connected with the title of the Messiah is that of *the* prophet, who occupied a large space in the Messianic horizon of the Jews—the prophet whom Moses had foretold, conceived by some to be the Messiah himself, by others an attendant in his train. In one passage only (John vii., 40) is ὁ προφήτης, so used, rightly given in our version. In the rest (John i., 21, 25; vi., 14) its force is weakened by the exaggerated rendering "*that* prophet;" while in the margin of i., 21 (as if to show how little they understood the exigencies of the article), our translators have offered an alternative, "Art thou *a* prophet?"

As relating to the person and office of Christ another very important illustration presents itself. In Col. i., 19, St. Paul declares that ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι, which is rendered "For it pleased *the Father* that in him should all

* I find that the view which is here maintained of the use of Χριστὸς and ὁ Χριστὸς is different alike from that of Middleton (*Greek Article* on Mark ix., 41), and from those of others whom he criticises. I should add that I wrote all these paragraphs relating to the definite article without consulting Middleton, and without conscious reminiscence of his views on any of the points discussed.

fullness dwell." Here an important theological term is suppressed by the omission of the article; for τὸ πλήρωμα is "*the* fullness," "*the* plentitude," *pleroma* being a recognized expression to denote the totality of the divine powers and attributes (John i., 16; Eph. i., 23; iii., 19; iv., 13; Col. ii., 9), and one which afterwards became notorious in the speculative systems of the Gnostic sects. And with this fact before us, it is a question whether we should not treat τὸ πλήρωμα as a quasi-personality, and translate, "In Him all *the* Fullness was pleased to dwell," thus getting rid of the ellipsis which our translators have supplied by *the Father* in italics; but, at all events, the article must be preserved.

Again, more remotely connected with our Lord's office is another error of omission. It is true of Christianity, as it is true of no other religious system, that the religion is identified with, is absorbed in, the Person of its founder. The Gospel is Christ, and Christ only. This fact finds expression in many ways, but more especially in the application of the same language to the one and to the other. In most cases this identity of terms is equally apparent in the English and in the Greek; but in one instance it is obliterated by a mistranslation of the definite article. Our Lord, in St. John's Gospel, in answer to the disciple's question, "How can we know *the way?*" answers, "I am *the way*" (xiv., 5, 6). Corresponding to this, we ought to find that in no less than four places in the Acts of the Apostles the Gospel is called "*the* way" absolutely: ix., 2, "If he found any that were of *the way* (ἐάν τινας εὕρῃ τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας);" xix., 9, "Divers believed not, but spake evil of *the way;*" xix., 23, "There arose no small stir about *the way;*" xxiv., 22, "Having more perfect knowledge of *the way;*" but in all these passages the fact disappears in the English Version, which varies the rendering between "*this* way" and "*that* way," but never once translates τὴν ὁδόν, "*the* way."

But more especially are these omissions of the article frequent in those passages which relate to the second advent

and its accompanying terrors or glories. The imagery of this great crisis was definitely conceived, and, as such, the apostles refer to it. In the Epistles to the Thessalonians more especially, St. Paul mentions having repeatedly dwelt on these topics to his converts: "Remember ye not that when I was yet with you I told you these things?" 2 Thess. ii., 5. Accordingly, he appeals to incidents connected with the second advent as known facts: *ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀποστασία πρῶτον καὶ ἀποκαλυφθῇ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας* [v. l. *ἀνομίας*], "Except *the* falling away come first and *the* man of sin be revealed," where our version makes the apostle say "*a* falling away," "*that* man of sin," just as a little lower down it translates *ὁ ἄνομος* "*that* wicked" instead of "*the* lawless one." Similarly in the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi., 10) it is said of Abraham in the original that "He looked for *the* city which hath *the* foundations (*ἐξεδέχετο τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν πόλιν*)." A definite image here rises before the sacred writer's mind of the new Jerusalem such as it is described in the Apocalypse, "The wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb (xxi., 14);" "The foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones, etc." (xxi., 19 seq.).* But in our version the words are robbed of their meaning, and Abraham is made to look for "*a* city which hath foundations"—a senseless expression, for no city is without them. Again, in the Apocalypse, the definite article is more than once disregarded under similar circumstances. Take, for instance, vii., 12, 14, "What are these which are arrayed in white robes (*τὰς στολὰς τὰς λευκάς*)?" with the reply, "These are they which came out of great tribulation (*ἐκ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλες*);" xvii., 1, "That sitteth *on many waters*" (*ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων τῶν πολλῶν*, for this was the reading in their text). And another instance, not very dissimilar, occurs in the Gospels. The same expression is used six times in St. Matthew (viii., 12; xiii., 42, 50; xxii., 13; xxiv., 51; xxv., 30),

* See Abp. Trench's *Authorized Version*, p. 70, 71.

and once in St. Luke (xiii., 28), to describe the despair and misery of the condemned; *ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων*, where the rendering should be corrected into "There shall be *the* wailing and *the* gnashing of teeth."

The last instance which I shall take connected with this group of facts and ideas relating to the end of the world is more subtle, but not, on that account, less important. I refer to the peculiar sense of *ἡ ὀργή*, as occurring in a passage which has been variously explained, but which seems to admit only of one probable interpretation, Rom. xii., 19, *μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες, ἀγαπητοί, ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ· γέγραπται γὰρ Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει Κύριος.* With this compare Rom. v., 9, *σωθησόμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς*, which is rendered "We shall be saved from wrath through him," and more especially 1 Thess. ii., 16, *ἔφθασεν (ἔφθακεν) δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος*, where the definite article is correctly reproduced in our version, "For *the* wrath is come upon them to the uttermost." From these passages it appears that *ἡ ὀργή*, "*the* wrath," used absolutely, signifies the divine retribution; and the force of St. Paul's injunction in Rom. xii., 19, *δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ* is this: "Do not avenge yourselves: do not anticipate the divine retribution; do not thrust yourselves into God's place, but leave room for his judgments"—a sense which the English rendering "rather give place unto wrath" does not suggest, and probably was not intended to represent. In the same way, *τὸ θέλημα* is the divine will (Rom. ii., 18, *γινώσκεις τὸ θέλημα*),* and *τὸ ὄνομα* the divine name (Phil. ii., 9, *τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ*

* This word *θέλημα* came to be so appropriated to the divine will that it is sometimes used in this sense even without the definite article; e. g., Ignat., *Rom.*, 1, *ἐάνπερ θέλημα ᾖ τοῦ καταξιωθῆναί με* (the correct text); *Ephes.*, 20, *ἐάν με καταξιώσῃ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ ὑμῶν καὶ θέλημα ᾖ*; *Smyrn.*, 1, *υἱὸν Θεοῦ κατὰ θέλημα καὶ δύναμιν* [Θεοῦ] (where Θεοῦ is doubtful).

These passages point to the true interpretation of 1 Cor. xvi., 12, *οὐκ ἦν θέλημα ἵνα νῦν ἔλθῃ, ἐλεύσεται δὲ ὅταν εὐκαιρήσῃ*, which is (I believe) universally interpreted as in our English Version, "his will was not to come," but which ought to be explained, "It was not God's will that he should come."

They also indicate, as I believe, the true reading in Rom. xv., 32, *ἵνα ἐν χαρᾷ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς διὰ θελήματος*, where various additions appear in the

πᾶν ὄνομα). In the last passage, however, it is unfair to charge our translators with an inaccurate rendering, "gave him a name," for their incorrect text omitted the article; but τὸ ὄνομα is the true reading, and it is superfluous to remark how much is gained thereby.

In other passages, where no doctrinal considerations are involved, a historical incident is misrepresented or the meaning of a passage is perverted by the neglect or the mistranslation of the article. Thus, in two several passages, St. Paul's euphemism of τὸ πρᾶγμα, when speaking of sins of the flesh, is effaced, and he is made to say something else: in 1 Thess. iv., 6, "That no man go beyond and defraud his brother in *any* matter" (ἐν τῷ πράγματι), where the sin of dishonest gain is substituted for the sin of unbridled sensuality by the mistranslation; and in 2 Cor. vii., 11, "Ye have approved yourselves to be clear in *this* matter (ἐν τῷ πράγματι)," where, though the perversion is much less considerable, a slightly different turn is given to the apostle's meaning by substituting "this" for "the." Again, in 1 Cor. v., 9, where St. Paul is made to say, "I wrote to you in *an* epistle" (instead of "*my* epistle" or "letter"), the mistranslation of ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ has an important bearing on the interpretation of his allusion. Again, in 2 Cor. xii., 18, "I desired Titus, and with him I sent *a* brother (τὸν ἀδελφόν)," the error adds to the difficulty in discerning the movements of St. Paul's delegates previous to the writing of the letter. And in such renderings as John iii., 10, σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ; "Art thou *a* master of Israel?" and Rev. iii., 17, σὺ εἶ ὁ ταλαίπωρος καὶ [ὁ] ἐλεεινὸς, "Thou art wretched and miserable," though there is no actual misleading, the passages lose half their force by the omission.

In another class of passages some fact of geography or archæology lurks under the definite article, such as could proceed only from the pen of an eye-witness, or at least of one intimately acquainted with the circumstances. In al-

MSS.: Θεοῦ in AC, κυρίου Ἰησοῦ in B, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in ℵ, Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ in DFG, but where θέλημα appears to be used absolutely.

most every instance of this kind the article is neglected in our version, though it is obviously important at a time when the evidences of Christianity are so narrowly scanned that these more minute traits of special knowledge should be kept in mind. Thus, for instance, in John xii., 13, "They took branches of palm-trees," the original has *τὰ βαΐα τῶν φοινίκων*, "*the* branches of *the* palm-trees"—the trees with which the evangelist himself was so familiar, which clothed the eastern slopes of the Mount of Olives, and gave its name to the village of Bethany, "the house of dates." Thus, again, in the Acts (ix., 35), the words translated "Lydda and Saron" are *Λύδδα καὶ τὸν Σαρωνᾶ*, "Lydda and *the* Sharon,"* the former being the town, the latter the district in the neighborhood, and therefore having the definite article in this, the only passage in which it occurs in the New Testament, as it always has in the Old Testament, Hash-sharon, "*the* Sharon," the woody plain, just as we talk of "the weald," "the downs," etc.† Again, there is mention of "*the* pinnacle (*τὸ πτερύγιον*) of the Temple" in the record of the temptation (Matt. iv., 5; Luke iv., 9)—the same expression likewise being used by the Jewish Christian historian Hegesippus in the second century, when describing the martyrdom of James, the Lord's brother, who is thrown down from "*the πτερύγιον*;"‡ so that (whatever may be the exact meaning of the word translated "pinnacle") some one definite place is meant, and the impression conveyed to the English reader by "*a* pinnacle" is radically

* The reading *ἀσάρωνα* or *ἀσσάρωνα*, which is found in some few second-rate authorities, is a reproduction of the Hebrew, founded perhaps on the note of Origen (?). *τινὲς δὲ ἀσσάρωνα φασιν, οὐχὶ σαρῶνα, ὕπερ κρεῖττον* (see Tisch., *Nov. Test. Græc.*, ed. 8, ii., p. 80). In direct contrast to this unconscious reduplication of the article stands the reading of ℵ (corrected, however, by a later hand), which omits the *τόν*, from not understanding the presence of the article.

† The illustration is Mr. Grove's, in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, s. v. *Saron*.

‡ In Euseb., *H. E.*, ii., 23, *στῆθι οὖν ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ . . . ἔστησαν οὖν οἱ προειρημένοι γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι τὸν Ἰάκωβον ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ναοῦ*.

wrong. Again, in the history of the cleansing of the Temple, the reference to the seats of them that sold "*the* doves" (τὰς περιστερὰς) in two evangelists (Matt. xxi., 12; Mark xi., 15) indicates the pen of a narrator who was accustomed to the sight of the doves which might be purchased within the sacred precincts by worshipers intending to offer the purificatory offerings enjoined by the Mosaic law (Luke ii., 24). In like manner, "*the* bushel" and "*the* candlestick" in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v., 15; comp. Mark iv., 21; Luke xi., 33) point to the simple and indispensable furniture in every homely Jewish household. And elsewhere casual allusions to "*the* cross-way" (Mark xi., 4), "*the* steep" (Mark v., 13, "a steep place," A.V), "*the* synagogue" or "*οἱ*ν synagogue" (Luke vii., 5, "He hath built us a synagogue," A.V.*), and the like—which are not unfrequent—all have their value, and ought not to be obscured.

But there are two remarkable instances of the persistent presence of the definite article—both connected with the Lake of Galilee—which deserve special attention, but which, nevertheless, do not appear at all to the English reader.

Most students of the New Testament have had their attention called to the fact that our Lord, before delivering the discourse which we call "the Sermon on the Mount," is recorded to have gone up, not "into a mountain," but "into *the* mountain" (τὸ ὄρος), Matt. v., 1;† and they have been taught

* In Acts xvii., 1, also, where the A.V. has "Thessalonica, where was *a* synagogue of the Jews," our translators certainly read ὅπου ἦν ἡ συναγωγή, though the article must be omitted in the Greek, if a strong combination of the oldest authorities is to have weight.

† Dean Stanley (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 361), supporting the traditional site of the "Mount of Beatitudes," writes, "None of the other mountains in the neighborhood could answer equally well to this description, inasmuch as they are merged into the uniform barrier of hills round the lake, whereas this stands separate—'the mountain,' which alone could lay claim to a distinct name, with the one exception of Tabor, which is too distant to answer the requirement." If the view which I have taken in the text be correct, this "uniform barrier of hills" would itself be τὸ ὄρος: at all events, the fact that τὸ ὄρος is the common expression in the evangelists shows that the definite article does not distinguish the locality of the Sermon on the Mount from those

to observe also that St.Luke (vi., 17), in describing the locality where a discourse very similar to St.Matthew's Sermon on the Mount is held, says, "He came down with them and stood," not (as our English Version makes him say) "*in the plain*" (as if *ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ*), but "*on a level place*" (*ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ*), where the very expression suggests that the spot was situated in the midst of a hilly country. Thus, by respecting the presence of the article in the one evangelist and its absence in the other, the two accounts are so far brought into accordance that the description of the localities, at all events, offers no impediment to our identifying the discourses.

But it is important to observe in addition that whenever the evangelists speak of incidents occurring above the shores of the Lake of Galilee, they *invariably* use *τὸ ὄρος*,* and never *ὄρος* or *τὰ ὄρη*, either of which, at first sight, would have seemed more natural. The probable explanation of this fact is, that *τὸ ὄρος* stands for the mountain district—the hills as opposed to the level shores—more especially as the corresponding Hebrew הָהָר is frequently so used, and in such cases is translated *τὸ ὄρος* in the LXX.: e.g., "the mountain of Judah," "the mountain of Ephraim," Josh. xvii., 16; xix., 50; xx., 7, etc.† But, whatever may be the explanation, the article ought to be retained throughout.

Only less persistent‡ is the presence of the article in "the

of several other incidents in this neighborhood, though possibly the independent reasons in favor of the traditional site may be sufficient without this aid.

* The only exceptions, I believe, to the insertion of the definite article are in the cases of the temptation (Matt. iv., 8 [Luke iv., 5]) and of the transfiguration (Matt. xvii., 1; Mark ix., 2), in all which passages the expression is *εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν* [*λίαν*].

† It is no objection to this interpretation that St.Luke twice uses the more classical expression *ἡ ὀρεινὴ* in speaking of the hill-country of Judæa: i., 39, 65. Wherever he treads on the same ground with St.Matthew and St.Mark, he has *τὸ ὄρος*. The portion of his narrative in which *ἡ ὀρεινὴ* occurs is derived from some wholly independent source.

‡ The common text, however, inserts the article in a few passages where it is absent from one or more of the best MSS. (e.g., Matt. viii., 23; ix., 1; xiii., 2; xiv., 22; Mark iv., 1; vi., 30, 45). In Matt. xiv., 13, *ἐν πλοίῳ* is read by all the ancient authorities which have the words at all. In cases

ship" (τὸ πλοῖον) in connection with the navigation of the Sea of Galilee. Whatever may be the significance of this fact—whether it simply bears testimony to the vividness with which each scene in succession presented itself to the first narrator or narrators, or whether some one well-known boat was intended (as the narrative of John vi., 22 seq. might suggest)—the article ought to have been preserved in the English Version; whereas in this case, as in the last, the translators have been guided, not by grammar, but by "common sense," for the most part translating τὸ ὄρος, τὸ πλοῖον, on each occasion where they appear first in connection with a fresh incident by "*a* mountain," "*a* ship," and afterwards by "*the* mountain," "*the* ship."

Yet, on the other hand, where this phenomenon appears in the original Greek, that is, where an object is indefinite when first introduced and becomes definite after its first mention, our translators have frequently disregarded this "common-sense" rule, and departed from the Greek. Thus, in the account of St.Peter's three denials in Mark xiv., 69, we are told that "one of the maid-servants (μία τῶν παιδισκῶν) of the high-priest" questioned him and elicited his first denial; then, ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν πάλιν ἤρξατο λέγειν, "*The* maid-servant, seeing him again, began to say;" but our translators in the second passage render it "*a* maid-servant," thus making two distinct persons. The object was doubtless to bring the narrative into strict conformity with Matt. xxvi., 69, 71 (μία παιδίσκη . . . ἄλλη); but, though there might seem to be an immediate gain here, this disregard of grammar is really a hinderance to any satisfactory solution, where an exact agreement in details is unimportant, and where strict harmony, if attainable, must depend on the tumultuous character of the scene, in which more than one interrogator would speak at the same time.* Our translators, however, were at fault, not

where the MSS. differ it is not easy to see whether or not the omission of the article was a scribe's correction. Generally it may be said that the article with πλοῖον is more persistent in the other evangelists than in St.Matthew.

* See the solution in Westcott's *Introduction to the Gospels*, p. 280.

through any want of honesty, but from their imperfect knowledge of grammar, for they repeatedly err in the same way where no purpose is served; e.g., Mark ii., 15, 16, "Many publicans and sinners (*πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί*) sat also together with Jesus . . . and when the scribes and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners (*μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν*) . . . How is it that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners (*μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν*)?" . . . 1 John v., 6, "This is he that came by water and blood (*δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος*), even Jesus Christ; not by water (*ἐν τῷ ὕδατι*) only, but by water (*ἐν τῷ ὕδατι*) and blood (*τῷ αἵματι*);" Rev. xi., 9, 11, "Shall see their dead bodies three days and a half (*ἡμέρας τρεῖς καὶ ἥμισυ*) . . . And after three days and a half (*μετὰ τὰς τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ ἥμισυ*), etc." Omissions of this class are very numerous.

The error of inserting the article where it is absent is less frequent than that of omitting it where it is present, but not less injurious to the sense. Thus, in 1 Tim. iii., 11, *γυναῖκας ὡσαύτως σεμνὰς* would hardly have been rendered "even so must *their wives* be grave" if the theory of the definite article had been understood; for our translators would have seen that the reference is to *γυναῖκας διακόνους*, "women-deacons" or "deaconesses," and not to the wives of the deacons.* Again, in John iv., 27, *ἐθαύμαζον ὅτι μετὰ γυναικὸς ἐλάλει*, the English Version, "They marveled that he talked with *the* woman," implies that the disciples knew her shameful history—a highly improbable supposition, since she is obviously a stranger whose character our Lord reads through his divine intuition alone; whereas the true rendering, "He talked with *a* wom-

* The office of deaconess is mentioned only in one other passage in the New Testament (Rom. xvi., 1), and there also it is obliterated in the English Version by the substitution of the vague expression "which is a servant" for the more definite *οὖσαν διάκονον*. If the testimony borne in these two passages to a ministry of women in the apostolic times had not been thus blotted out of our English Bibles, attention would probably have been directed to the subject at an earlier date, and our English Church would not have remained so long maimed in one of her hands.

an," which indeed alone explains the emphatic position of γυναικός, points to their surprise that he should break through the conventional restraints imposed by rabbinical authority and be seen speaking to one of the other sex in public.* Again, in Luke vi., 16, ὃς [καὶ] ἐγένετο προδότης ought not to be translated "which also was *the* traitor," because the subsequent history of Judas is not assumed to be known to St. Luke's readers, but "who also *became* a traitor." Again, it is important for geographical reasons that in Acts viii., 5, Philip should not be represented as going down "to *the* city of Samaria" (εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας), if the reading which our translators had before them be correct,† because the rendering may lead to a wrong identification of the place. And, lastly, κατὰ ἑορτήν, which means simply "at festival-time," should not be translated "at *the* feast" (Luke xxiii., 17), still less "at *that* feast" (Matt. xxvii., 15; Mark xv., 6), because these renderings seem to limit the custom to the feast of the Passover—a limitation which is not implied in the original expression, and certainly is not required by the parallel passage in St. John (xviii., 39). Happily, in another passage (John v., 1, μετὰ ταῦτα ἦν ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων), which is important in its bearing on the chronology of our Lord's life, our translators have respected the omission of the article before ἑορτή; but that their accuracy in this instance was purely accidental appears from the fact that a chapter later (vi., 4), τὸ πάσχα ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων is rendered "the Passover, *a* feast of the Jews."

But if, after the examples already given, any doubt could still remain that the theory of the definite article was wholly unknown to our translators, the following passages, in which almost every conceivable rule is broken, must be regarded as conclusive: Matt. iii., 4, αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰωάνης εἶχεν τὸ ἔνδυμα, "And *the same* John had his raiment" (where the true rendering, "But John himself," involves an antithesis of the prophetic

* A rabbinical precept was, "Let no one talk with a woman in the street, no, not with his own wife:" see Lightfoot's *Works*, ii., p. 543.

† εἰς τὴν πόλιν, however, ought almost certainly to be read.

announcement and the actual appearance of the Baptist); John iv., 37, *ἐν τούτῳ ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ ἀληθινός*, "Herein is that saying true;" *ib.*, v., 44, *τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ*, "The honor that cometh from *God only*;" Acts xi., 17, *τὴν ἴσην δωρεὰν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν πιστεύσασιν ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον*, "God gave them the like gift as he did unto us *who* believed on the Lord;" 1 Cor. viii., 10, 11, *ἡ συνείδησις αὐτοῦ ἀσθενοῦς ὄντος . . . . τύπτοντες αὐτῶν τὴν συνείδησιν ἀσθενοῦσαν*, "The conscience of *him that is weak* . . . wound *their weak* conscience;" 2 Cor. viii., 19, *πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου δόξαν*, "To the glory of *the same* Lord;" 1 Tim. vi., 2, *πιστοί εἰσιν καὶ ἀγαπητοὶ οἱ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι*, "They are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit;" *ib.*, vi., 5, *νομιζόντων πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν*, "Supposing that gain is godliness;" 2 Tim. ii., 19, *ὁ μέντοι στερεὸς θεμέλιος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἕστηκεν*, "Nevertheless, the foundation of God standeth sure;" Heb. vi., 8, *ἐκφέρουσα δὲ ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους ἀδόκιμος*, "But *that which beareth* thorns and briers is rejected;" *ib.*, vi., 16, *πάσης αὐτοῖς ἀντιλογίας πέρας εἰς βεβαίωσιν ὁ ὅρκος*, "*An oath for confirmation* is to them an end of all strife;" *ib.*, ix., 1, *τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν*, "And a worldly sanctuary;" *ib.*, x., 1, *ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις ἃς προσφέρουσιν*, "With *those* sacrifices which they offered;" Rev. xix., 9, *οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι ἀληθινοί εἰσι τοῦ Θεου*, "These are *the true sayings* of God."

There is, however, one passage in which this fault is committed, and on which it may be worth while to dwell at greater length, because it does not appear to have been properly understood. In John v., 35, the words *ἐκεῖνος ἦν ὁ λύχνος ὁ καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων*, in which our Lord describes the Baptist, are translated in our version, "He was a burning and a shining light." Thus rendered, the expression appears as intended simply to glorify John. But this is not the sense which the context requires, and it is only attained by a flagrant disregard of the articles. Commentators have correctly pointed out that John is here called *ὁ λύχνος*, "the lamp;" he was not *τὸ φῶς*, "the light" (i., 8);* for Christ himself, and

* Here again (i., 8) much is lost in the English Version by rendering *οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς*, "He was not *that* light."

Christ only, is "*the* light" (i., 9; iii., 19; ix., 5, etc.). Thus the rendering of ὁ λύχνος is vitally wrong, as probably few would deny. But it has not been perceived how much the contrast between the Baptist and the Savior is strengthened by a proper appreciation of the remaining words ὁ καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων. The word καίειν is "to burn, to kindle," as in Matt. v., 15, οὐδὲ καίουσιν λύχνον, "Neither do men light a candle:" so, too, Luke xii., 35, οἱ λύχνοι καιόμενοι, Rev. iv., 5; viii., 10. Thus it implies that the light is not inherent, but borrowed; and the force of the expression will be, "He is the lamp that is kindled, and so shineth." Christ himself is the centre and source of light; the Baptist has no light of his own, but draws all his illumination from this greater one. He is only as the light of the candle, for whose rays, indeed, men are grateful, but which is pale, flickering, transitory, compared with the glories of the eternal flame from which itself is kindled.

3. After the tenses and the definite article, the *prepositions* deserve to be considered; for here, also, there is much room for improvement.

Of these, διὰ holds the first place in importance; yet, in dealing with this preposition, we are met with a difficulty. The misunderstandings which arise in the mind of an English reader are due in most passages rather to the archaisms than to the errors of our translators; and archaisms are very intractable. Where, in common language, we now say "by" and "through" (*i. e.*, "by means of") respectively, our translators, following the diction of their age, generally use "of" and "by" respectively—"of" denoting the agent (ὑπό), and "by" the instrument or means (διά). This, however, is not universally the case; but ὑπὸ is sometimes translated "by" (e. g., Luke ii., 18), and διὰ sometimes "through" (e. g., John i., 7). Such exceptions seem to show that the language was already in a state of transition; and this supposition is confirmed by observing that in the first passage Tyndale and the earlier versions render τῶν λαληθέντων αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν ποιμένων,

"those things which were told them *of* the shepherds"—a rendering still retained even in the Bishops' and Geneva Bibles, and first altered apparently by King James's revisers.

From these archaisms great ambiguity arises. When we hear "it was said *of* him," we understand at once "*about* or *concerning* him," but this is not the meaning which this preposition bears in our New Testament. And again, when we read "it was sent *by* me," we understand "I sent it," but neither again is this the meaning intended. In the modern language "by" represents the *sender* (ὑπό), whereas in the old it denotes the *bearer* (διά) of the letter or parcel. We do not venture to use "*by*," meaning the intermediate agency or instrument, except in cases where the form or the matter of the sentence shows distinctly that the primary agent is not intended, so that no confusion is possible, as "I sent it *by* him," "I was informed *by* telegraph." Otherwise misunderstanding is inevitable. Thus, in Acts xii., 9, "He wist not that it was true which was done *by* the angel" (τὸ γινόμενον διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου), or in Acts ii., 43, "Many words and signs were done *by* the apostles" (διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγίνετο), no English reader would suspect that the angel and the apostles respectively are represented as the doers only in the sense in which a chisel may be said to carve a piece of wood, as instruments in the hands of an initiative power. In the same way, Acts ii., 23, "Ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain" is, I fancy, wholly misunderstood; nor, indeed, would it be easy, without a knowledge of the Greek, διὰ χειρῶν ἀνόμων;* to discover that by the "wicked hands," or rather "lawless hands," is meant the instrumentality of the ἄνομοι, the heathen Romans, whom the Jews addressed by St. Peter had used as their tools to compass our Lord's death. And again, such renderings as Gal. iii., 19, "ordained by angels" (διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων), and Ephes. iii., 10, "might be known by

* I have taken χειρῶν as the reading which our translators had before them. But the correct text is unquestionably διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων, "by the hand of lawless men," which brings out the sense still more clearly.

the Church (γνωρισθῇ διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *i. e.*, might be made known through the Church) the manifold wisdom of God," are quite misleading. It was not, however, for the sake of such isolated examples as these that I entered upon this discussion. There are two very important *classes* of passages, in which the distinction between ὑπό (ἀπό) and διὰ is very important, and in which, therefore, this ambiguity is much to be regretted.

The first of these has reference to *Inspiration*. Wherever the sacred writers have occasion to quote or to refer to the Old Testament, they invariably apply the preposition διά, as denoting *instrumentality*, to the lawgiver, or the prophet, or the psalmist, while they reserve ὑπό, as signifying the primary motive agency, to God himself. This rule is, I believe, universal. Some few exceptions, it is true, occur in the received text, but all these vanish when the readings of the older authorities are adopted;* and this very fact is significant, because it points to a contrast between the persistent idea of the sacred writers themselves and the comparative indifference of their later transcribers. Sometimes διὰ occurs alone, e. g., Matt. xxi., 4, τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου; xxiv., 15, τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιήλ, etc.; sometimes in close connection with ὑπό, e. g., Matt. i., 22, τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου (comp. ii., 15). It is used, moreover, not only when the word is mentioned as *spoken*, but also when it is mentioned as *written*; e. g., Matt. ii., 5, οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προφήτου; Luke xviii., 31, πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. Yet this significant fact is wholly lost to the English reader.

* In Matt. ii., 17; iii., 3, the readings of the received text are ὑπὸ Ἱερεμίου, ὑπὸ Ἡσαΐου respectively, but all the best critical editions read διὰ in both places, following the preponderance of ancient authority. In Matt. xxvii., 35; Mark xiii., 14, the clauses containing ὑπὸ in this connection are interpolations, and are struck out in the best editions.

In all these four passages our A.V. has "by," though the translators had ὑπὸ in their text, and (following their ordinary practice) should have rendered it "of." Tyndale, who led the way, probably having no distinct grammatical conception of the difference of ὑπὸ and διὰ, followed his theological instinct herein, and thus extracted the right sense out of the false reading.

The other class of passages has a still more important theological bearing, having reference to the *Person of Christ.* The preposition, it is well known, which is especially applied to the Office of the Divine Word, is διά; e. g., John i., 3, 10, πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο . . . ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο; 1 Cor. viii., 6, εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ; Col. i., 16, τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται; Heb. i., 2, δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας; ii., 10, δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα. In all such passages the ambiguous "by" is a serious obstacle to the understanding of the English reader. In the Nicene Creed itself, the expression "By whom (δι' οὗ) all things were made," even when it is seen that the relative refers not to the Father, but to the Son (and the accidental circumstance that the Father is mentioned just before misleads many persons on this point), yet fails to suggest any idea different from the other expression in the Creed, "Maker of heaven and earth," which had before been applied to the Father. The perplexity and confusion are still further increased by the indistinct rendering, "God *of* God, Light *of* Light," etc., for Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτος, κ.τ.λ. — words which in themselves represent the doctrine of God the Word as taught by St. John, but whose meaning is veiled by the English preposition *of.* Thus the Nicene doctrine is obscured in the Nicene formula itself as represented to the English ear, and the prejudice against it, which is necessarily excited by misunderstanding, ensues. The same misconception must attend the corresponding passages in the New Testament; e. g., John i., 3, 10, "All things were made by him," "The world was made by him." In this case it is much easier to point out the defect than to supply the remedy; but surely the English Version in this context is capricious in rendering δι' αὐτοῦ in the two passages already quoted "*by* him," and yet in an intermediate verse (7) translating πάντες πιστεύσωσιν δι' αὐτοῦ, "all men *through* him might believe," and then again returning to *by* in ver. 17, ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωυσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο, "The law was given *by* Moses,

but grace and truth came *by* Jesus Christ." If prescription is too powerful to admit the rendering "through" for διὰ throughout the passage, some degree of consistency, at least, might be attained, so that πιστεύσωσιν δι' αὐτοῦ and διὰ Μωυσέως ἐδόθη should be translated the same way.

But, though in the renderings of διὰ with the genitive we are confronted by archaisms rather than by errors, and it might be difficult, and perhaps not advisable, in many cases, to meddle with them, the same apology and the same impediment do not apply to this preposition as used with the accusative. Here our translators are absolutely wrong, and a correction is imperative. Though they do not ever (so far as I have noticed) translate διὰ with a genitive as though it had an accusative, they are frequently guilty of the converse error, and render it with an accusative as though it had a genitive. Thus Matt. xv., 3, 6, "Why do ye transgress the commandment of God? . . . ye have made the commandment of none effect *by* your tradition (διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν," *i.e.*, "for the sake of your tradition," or as it is expressed in the parallel passage, Mark vii., 9, ἵνα τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν τηρήσητε [στήσητε]); John xv., 3, "Now ye are clean *through* the word (διὰ τὸν λόγον);" Rom. ii., 24, "The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles *through* you (δι' ὑμᾶς);" 2 Cor. iv., 15, "That the abundant grace might *through* the thanksgiving of many redound to the glory of God (ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσασα διὰ τῶν πλειόνων τὴν εὐχαριστίαν περισσεύσῃ εἰς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ)," where it is perhaps best to govern τὴν εὐχαριστίαν by περισσεύσῃ taken as a transitive, but where the English Version, at all events, has three positive errors: (1.) translating ἡ χάρις πλεονάσασα as if ἡ πλεονάσασα χάρις; (2.) rendering τῶν πλειόνων as if πολλῶν; (3.) giving the wrong sense to διὰ with the accusative; Heb. iv., 7, "Bringing forth herbs meet for them *by* whom it is dressed (δι' οἷς γεωργεῖται)." Yet in Rom. viii., 11, "He shall also quicken your mortal bodies *by* his Spirit that dwelleth in you," our translators were apparently alive to the difference of signification in the various readings διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος

. . . πνεύματος and διὰ τὸ ἐνοικοῦν . . . πνεῦμα, for they add in the margin, "*Or*, because of his Spirit."

In translating the other prepositions also there is occasional laxity. Thus ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν is rendered "*in* the clouds" (Matt. xxiv., 30; xxvi., 64), though the imagery is marred thereby, and though the mention of "him that sat *on* the cloud (ἐπὶ τῆς νεφέλης)" in the Apocalypse (xiv., 15, 16) ought to have insured the correct translation. And similarly in Matt. iv., 6; Luke iv., 11, the English rendering "*In* their hands they shall bear thee up" presents a different picture from the ἐπὶ χειρῶν of the original.* Again, the proper force of εἰς is often sacrificed where the loss is not inappreciable. Thus, in 2 Cor. xi., 3, οὕτω φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἁπλότητος τῆς εἰς τὸν Χριστόν is rendered "So your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is *in* Christ," where the true idea is "sincerity or fidelity *towards* Christ," in accordance with the image in the context, "That I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ." Even more serious is the injury done to the sense in 1 Cor. viii., 6, ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς Θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ, where the studiously careful distribution of the prepositions in the original is entirely deranged by rendering εἰς αὐτόν "*in* him" instead of "*unto* him," though here a marginal alternative "*for* him" is given.

Again, a common form of error is the mistranslation of βαπ-

* In Mark xii., 26, οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μωϋσέως ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου, πῶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Θεός, "Have ye not read in the book of Moses how *in the bush* God spake unto him?" the wrong idea conveyed in the English Version arises more from neglect of the order than from mistranslation of the preposition. If the order of the original had been trusted, our translators would have seen that ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου must mean "in the passage relating to the bush," "in the passage called the bush" (comp. ἐν Ἠλίᾳ, Rom. xi., 2, "in the history of Elijah," where again our A.V. has the wrong rendering "*of* Elias"). Strangely enough, Wicliffe alone, of our English translators, gives the right meaning, "Han ye not rad in the book of Moises on the bousche how God seide to him?" In the parallel passage, Luke xx., 37, the rendering of our Authorized Version "at the bush" is, at all events, an improvement on the preceding translations "besides the bush."

τίζειν εἰς, as 1 Cor. i., 13, "Or were ye baptized *in* the name of Paul (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλου)?" So again, Matt. xxviii., 19; Acts viii., 16. In Acts xix., 3, 5, after being twice given correctly, "*Unto* what, then, were ye baptized? And they said *unto* John's baptism," nevertheless, when it occurs a third time, it is wrongly translated, "When they heard this, they were baptized *in* the name (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα) of the Lord Jesus." On the other hand, in Rom. vi., 3; 1 Cor. x., 2; xii., 13; Gal. iii., 27, the preposition is duly respected.

Again, though the influence of the Hebrew and Aramaic has affected the use of ἐν, so that it can not be measured by a strictly classical standard, still the license which our version occasionally takes is quite unjustifiable. In such passages as Rom. xiv., 14, οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, "I know and am persuaded *by* the Lord Jesus;" 1 Cor. xii., 13, καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ Πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, "For *by* one Spirit are we all baptized into one body," the Hebraic or instrumental sense of ἐν is indefensible.

Lastly, even prepositions with such well-defined meanings as ἀπὸ and ὑπέρ are not always respected; as, for example, in 2 Thess. ii., 1, 2, "Now we beseech you, brethren, *by* (ὑπέρ) the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and *by* our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken *in* mind (ἀπὸ τοῦ νούς);" while elsewhere παρὰ is similarly ill treated, 1 Pet. ii., 4, "Disallowed indeed of men (ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων), but chosen *of* God (παρὰ Θεῷ ἐκλεκτόν)."

Under these three heads the most numerous grammatical errors of our version fall. But other inaccuracies of divers kinds confront us from time to time, and some of these are of real importance. Any one who attempts to frame a system of the chronology of our Lord's life by a comparison of the Gospel narratives with one another and with contemporary Jewish history will know how perplexing is the statement in our English Version of Luke iii., 23, that Jesus, after his baptism, "*began to be* about thirty years of age." But the orig-

inal need not and (in fact) can not mean this; for ἦν ἀρχόμενος ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα must be translated "was about thirty years old *when he began*" (*i. e.*, at the commencement of his public life, his ministry); where ὡσεὶ is sufficiently elastic to allow a year or two, or even more, either under or *over* the thirty years; and, in fact, the notices of Herod's life in Josephus compared with St. Matthew's narrative seem to require that our Lord should have been somewhat *more* than thirty years old at the time. Again, such a translation as Phil. iv., 3, συνλαμβάνου αὐταῖς αἵτινες . . . συνήθλησάν μοι, "Help *those women which* labored with me," is impossible; and, going hand in hand with an error in the preceding verse, by which a man, "Euodias," is substituted for a woman, "Euodia,"* calls for correction. Again, in 2 Pet. iii., 12, the rendering of σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμέρας, "Hasting unto the coming of the day of God," can not stand, and the alternative suggested in the margin, "Hasting the coming," should be placed in the text; for the words obviously imply that the zeal and steadfastness of the faithful will be instrumental in speeding the final crisis. Again, the substitution of an interrogative for a relative in Matt. xxvi., 50, ἑταῖρε, ἐφ' ὃ πάρει, "Friend, wherefore art thou come?" is not warranted by New-Testament usage, though here our translators are supported by many modern commentators, and the expression must be treated as an aposiopesis, "Friend, *do that* for which thou art come."† Again, our translators have on more than one occasion indulged in the grammatical fiction of *Hypallage*, rendering πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας, "for the use of edifying," in Ephes. iv., 29, and ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον (Heb. vi., 1), "leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ." In both of these passages, however, there is a marginal note,

* The Versions of Tyndale and Coverdale, the Great Bible, and the Bishops' Bible, treat both as men's names, Euodias and Syntiches (Syntyches or Sintiches); the Geneva Testament (1557) gives both correctly; but the Geneva Bible takes up the intermediate position, and is followed by our A.V. All alike are wrong in the translation of αὐταῖς αἵτινες.

† Thus it may be compared with John xiii., 27, ὃ ποιεῖς, ποίησον τάχιον.

though in the first the alternative offered "to edify profitably" slurs over the difficulty. Such grammatical deformities as these should be swept away. Neither, again, should we tolerate such a rendering as 1 Cor. xii., 28, *ἀντιλήμψεις, κυβερνήσεις*, "helps *in* governments,"* where the original contemplates two distinct functions, of which *ἀντιλήμψεις* would apply mainly to the diaconate and *κυβερνήσεις* to the presbytery, but where our translators have had recourse to the grammatical fiction of *Hendiadys*. A somewhat similar instance to the last, where two detached words are combined in defiance of the sense, is 1 Cor. xvi., 22, "Let him be Anathema Maranatha," where doubtless the words should be separated; *ἤτω ἀνάθεμα· Μαρὰν ἀθά*, "Let him be anathema. Maran Atha" (*i. e.*, "The Lord cometh," or "is come").

Isolated examples of grammatical inaccuracy such as these might be multiplied; but I will close with one illustration, drawn from the treatment of the word *φαίνειν*. The distinction between *φαίνειν*, "to shine," and *φαίνεσθαι*, "to appear," is based on an elementary principle of grammar. It is therefore surprising that our translators should not have observed the difference. And yet, though the context in most cases leads them right, the errors of which they are guilty in particular passages show that they proceeded on no fixed principle. Thus we have in Acts xxvii., 20, *μήτε ἄστρων ἐπιφαινόντων ἐπὶ πλείονας ἡμέρας*, "Nor stars in many days *appeared*," and conversely in Matt. xxiv., 27, *καὶ φαίνεται ἕως δυσμῶν*, "And *shineth* even unto the west," and in Phil. ii., 15, *ἐν οἷς φαίνεσθε ὡς φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ*, "Among whom ye *shine* as lights in the world" (where the marginal alternative of an imperative "shine ye" is given, but no misgiving seems to have been suggested to our translators by the voice of *φαίνεσθε*).† When

* This is the rendering in the edition of 1611; but the preposition was struck out in the Cambridge edition of 1637 (and possibly earlier), and the text is commonly printed "helps, governments," but without any authority.

† Again, in Rev. xviii., 23, *φῶς λύχνου οὐ μὴ φανῇ ἐν σοὶ ἔτι*, if the word was accentuated as a passive (*φανῇ*) in the text used by our translators, as was probably the case, they have rendered it incorrectly, "The light of the

they have gone so far wrong in a simple matter of inflection, it is not surprising that syntactic considerations should have been overlooked, and that they should not have recognized the proper distinction between *φαίνομαι εἶναι*, "I appear to be," and *φαίνομαι ὤν*, "I am seen to be." Of this error they are guilty in Matt. vi., 16, 18, *ὅπως φανῶσιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις νηστεύοντες, ὅπως μὴ φανῇς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις νεστεύων*, "That they may appear unto men to fast," "That thou appear not unto men to fast," though the sense is correctly given by Tyndale (with whom most of the older versions agree substantially), "That they might be seen of men how they fast," "That it appear not unto men how that thou fastest."

The directly opposite fault to that which has just been discussed also deserves notice, and may perhaps be considered here. If hitherto attention has been directed to the ignorance or disregard of Greek grammar in our translators, it may be well to point out instances in which they have attempted to improve the original, where the connection is loose or the structure ungrammatical. This happens most frequently where past and present tenses are intermingled in the original; e.g., Matt. iii., 15, 16, *ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν . . . τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτόν . . . καὶ βαπτισθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέβη*, where, for the sake of symmetry, *ἀφίησιν* is translated *suffered;* or Mark xiv., 53, 54, *καὶ ἀπήγαγον τὸν Ἰησοῦν . . . καὶ συνέρχονται αὐτῷ πάντες . . . καὶ ὁ Πετρὸς ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ*, where, for the same reason, *συνέρχονται* is given *were assembled.* In all such cases there is no good reason for departing from the original. This is not a question of the idiom in different languages, but of the style of a particular author; and peculiarities of style should, as far as possible, be reproduced.

candle shall *shine* no more in thee;" but here Lachmann and others read the active *φάνῃ*. In Rev. viii., 12, they read *φαίνῃ*, and rightly translated it "shone;" but modern critical editors substitute *φάνῃ* or *φανῇ*. In Acts xxi., 3, "When we had discovered Cyprus," the correct text is probably *ἀναφανέντες δὲ τὴν Κύπρον*, but "discovered" seems to be intended as a translation of the other reading, *ἀναφάναντες*.

Moreover, our translators themselves have not ventured always to reduce the tenses to uniformity, so that the license they have taken results in capricious alterations here and there, which serve no worthy purpose.

These, however, are nothing more than loosenesses of style. But even grammatical inaccuracies ought to be preserved as far as possible, for it will generally be found that in such cases the grammar is sacrificed to some higher end—either greater force of expression or greater clearness of meaning. More than one instance of this occurs in the Apocalypse. In the letters to the Seven Churches the messages close with words of encouragement to the victor in the struggle. In the last four of these the words *ὁ νικῶν* are flung out at the beginning of the sentence without any regard to the subsequent construction, which in three out of the four is changed so that the nominative stands alone without any government: ii., 26, *καὶ ὁ νικῶν . . . . . δώσω αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν*; iii., 12, *ὁ νίκων, ποιήσω αὐτὸν στύλον*; iii., 21, *ὁ νικῶν, δώσω αὐτῷ καθίσαι.* In the first instance only have our translators had the courage to retain the broken grammar of the original, "And *he* that overcometh . . . *to him* will I give," acting thus boldly, perhaps, because the intervening words partly obscure the irregularity. In the other two cases they have set the grammar straight: "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar," "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit." Yet there was no sufficient reason for making a difference, and in all alike the English should have commenced as the Greek commences, "He that overcometh."

Would it be thought overbold if I were to counsel the same scrupulous adherence to the form of the original in a still more important passage? In Rev. i., 4, *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ* [*τοῦ*] *ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, the defiance of grammar is even more startling. It may be true that a cultivated Athenian could hardly have brought himself to write thus; but certainly the fisherman of Galilee did not so express himself from mere ignorance of Greek, for such ignorance as this

supposition would assume must have prevented his writing the Apocalypse at all. In this instance, at least, where the apostle is dealing with the Name of names, the motive which would lead him to isolate the words from their context is plain enough. And should not this remarkable feature be preserved in our English Bible? If in Exod. iii., 14, the words run, "I AM hath sent me unto you," may we not also be allowed to read here, "from HE THAT IS, AND THAT WAS, AND THAT IS TO COME?" Certainly the violation of grammar would not be greater in the English than it is in the Greek.

§ 5.

If the errors of grammar in our English Version are very numerous, those of *lexicography* are not so frequent. Yet even here several indisputable errors need correction; not a few doubtful interpretations may be improved; and many vague renderings will gain by being made sharper and clearer.

Instances of *impossible* renderings occur from time to time, though the whole number of these is not great. By impossible renderings I mean those cases in which our translators have assigned to a word a signification which it never bears elsewhere, and which, therefore, we must at once discard, without considering whether it does or does not harmonize with the context.

Such, for instance, is the treatment of the particles ἔτι and ἤδη in occasional passages where their meaning is interchanged in our version, as in Mark xiii., 28, ὅταν αὐτῆς ἤδη ὁ κλάδος ἁπαλὸς γένηται, κ.τ.λ., "When her branch is *yet* tender," for "As soon as its branch is tender" (the sign of approaching summer); and 2 Cor. i., 23, οὐκέτι ἦλθον εἰς Κόρινθον, "I came *not as yet* unto Corinth," for "I came *no more* unto Corinth" (I paid no fresh visit); or the rendering of ἅπαξ in Heb. xii., 26, ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείω, "Yet *once more* I shake;" or of καὶ γάρ in Matt. xv., 27, ναί, Κύριε, καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει, "Truth, Lord, *yet* the dogs eat." And when we turn from particles to nouns and verbs, examples will not fail us. Such are the renderings

of *ἀνεψιὸς* in Col. iv., 10, "Marcus, *sister's son* to Barnabas" (*ὁ ἀνεψιὸς Βαρνάβα*), for *cousin;* of *φθινοπωρινὸς* in Jude 12, "Trees *whose fruit withereth*, without fruit (*δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα*), twice dead, plucked up by the roots," for "*autumn* trees without fruit, etc.," where there appears to be a reference to the parable of the barren fig-tree (Luke xiii., 6), and where, at all events, the mention of the season when fruit might be expected is significant,* while under any circumstances the awkward contradiction of terms in our English Version should have suggested some misgiving; of *θριαμβεύειν* in 2 Cor. ii., 14, "God, which always *causeth us to triumph* (*τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς*) in Christ," for "leadeth us in triumph," where the image of the believer made captive and chained to the car of Christ is most expressive, while the paradox of the apostle's thanksgiving over his own spiritual defeat and thraldom is at once forcible and characteristic; and of *πάρεσις* in Rom. iii., 25, "To declare his righteousness *for the remission* of past sins (*διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων*)," for "*by reason of the passing over* of the former sins;" where the double error of mistranslating *διὰ*, and of giving *πάρεσις* the sense of *ἄφεσις*, has entirely shattered the meaning, and where the context implies that this signal manifestation of God's righteousness was vouchsafed, not because the sins were for-

* Strange to say, the earliest versions all rendered *φθινοπωρινὰ* correctly. Tyndale's instinct led him to give what I can not but think the right turn to the expression: "Trees with out frute at gadringe [gathering] time," *i.e.*, at the season when fruit was looked for; I can not agree with Archbishop Trench (p. 161), who maintains that "Tyndale was feeling after, though he has not grasped, the right translation," and himself explains *φθινοπωρινά, ἄκαρπα*, as "mutually completing one another," *without leaves, without fruit.* Tyndale was followed by Coverdale and the Great Bible. Similarly Wicliffe has "hervest trees without fruyt," and the Rheims Version "Trees of Autumne, unfruiteful." The earliest offender is the Geneva Testament, which gives "corrupt trees and without frute," a rendering adopted also in the Geneva Bible. The Bishops' Bible strangely combines both renderings, "trees withered [*φθίνειν*] at fruite geathering [*ὀπώρα*] and without fruite," which is explained in the margin "Trees withered in Autumne when the fruite harvest is, and so the Greke woord importeth," while at the same time other alternative interpretations are given.

given, but because they were only overlooked for the time without being forgiven.* Other examples, again, are *συλαγωγεῖν* in Col. ii., 8, *μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν*, "Lest any man spoil you," for "*make spoil* of you," "*carry* you *off as plunder*;" *προβιβάζειν* in Matt. xiv., 8, *προβιβάσθεῖσα ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς*, "Being *before instructed* by her mother," for "being *put forward*, urged, by her mother," for there is no instance of the temporal sense of the preposition in this compound; *ἐπερώτημα* in 1 Pet. iii., 21, "The *answer* of a good conscience toward God," for "the *question*," where the word may mean a *petition*, but certainly can not mean an *answer*; *δικαιώματα* in Rom. ii., 26, "If the circumcision keep the *righteousness* of the law," for "the *ordinances* of the law;" *πωροῦν, πώρωσις*, in the Epistles (Rom. xi., 7, 25; 2 Cor. iii., 14; Eph. iv., 18), where they are always rendered "blind, blindness," though correctly translated in the Gospels (Mark iii., 5; vi., 52; John xii., 40), "harden, hardness."†

In some cases the wrong rendering of our translators arose from a false derivation, which was generally accepted in their age. Thus *ἀκέραιος* is rendered "harmless" (from *κέρας, κεραΐζω*), Matt. x., 16; Phil. ii., 15, instead of "simple, pure, sincere" (from *κεράννυμι*, "to mix, adulterate"), though in Rom. xvi., 19 it is correctly given.‡ So also *ἐριθεία* is taken to mean "strife, contention" (Rom. ii., 8; 2 Cor. xii., 20; Gal. v., 20; Phil. i., 17; ii., 3; James iii., 14, 16), from its supposed connection with *ἔρις*; whereas its true derivation is from *ἔριθος*, "a hired partisan," so that it denotes "party spirit." And again, in

* An alternative sense of *πάρεσιν* is given in the margin, "*or* passing over;" but this is not sufficient to elicit the right meaning without also correcting the rendering of *διά*.

† This illustrates the incongruity which results from assigning different parts of the New Testament to different persons. In the instance before us, however, a compromise is effected by marginal alternatives. In Mark iii., 5, the margin has "*or* blindness;" in Rom. xi., 7, 25; Eph. iv., 18, "*or* hardened," "*or* hardness." In the other passages there is no margin in the edition of 1611.

‡ In Matt. x., 16, however, the margin has "*or* simple," and in Phil. ii., 15, "*or* sincere."

Jude 12, οὗτοί εἰσιν ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες, "These are *spots* in your feasts of charity," σπιλάδες, "rocks," is translated as if σπῖλοι, "spots;"* our translators having doubtless been influenced by the parallel passage 2 Pet. ii., 13, σπῖλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν, "*Spots* are they and blemishes, sporting themselves with their own deceivings."† The last example of this class of errors which I shall take is the surname of Simon the apostle, "the Canaanite." The correct form of the word is Καναναῖος, not Κανανίτης, in both passages where it occurs (Matt. x., 4; Mark iii., 18), but the latter stood in the text which our translators had before them. Yet this false reading certainly should not have misled them, for Χαναναῖος, the word for the Canaanite in the LXX. and in Matt. xv., 22, is even farther from Κανανίτης than from Καναναῖος. The parallel passages in St. Luke (Luke vi., 15; Acts i., 13) point to the fact that this surname is the Aramaic word Kanan, קַנָּאן, corresponding to the Greek ζηλωτής, "the Zealot;‡

* At least this is the view taken by modern commentators almost universally; but it does not seem to me certain that σπιλάδες here can not mean "spots;" for (1.) All the early versions connect it with this root, translating it either as a substantive "stains," or as an adjective "polluted." This is the case with the Old and the Revised Latin, with both the Egyptian versions, and with the Philoxenian Syriac; not have I noticed a single one which renders it "rocks." (2.) As σπῖλος (or σπίλος), which generally signifies a "spot" or "stain," sometimes has the sense "a rock," so conversely it is quite possible that σπιλάς, "a rock," should occasionally exchange its ordinary meaning for that of σπῖλος. (3.) In one of the Orphic poems, *Lith.*, 614, κατάστικτον σπιλάδεσσι πυρσῇσιν λευκαῖς τε μελαινομέναις χλοιραῖς τε, it has this sense; and, though this poem was apparently not written till the fourth century, still it seems highly improbable that the writer should have derived this sense of the word solely from St. Jude. If he did so, it only shows how fixed this interpretation had become before his time. (4.) The extreme violence of the metaphor, "rocks in your feasts of charity," is certainly not favorable to the interpretation which it is proposed to substitute. And (5.) though this argument must not be pressed, yet the occurrence of σπῖλοι καὶ μῶμοι in the parallel passage (2 Pet. ii., 13) must be allowed some weight in determining the sense of σπιλάδες here.

† I have quoted the passage as it stands in the received text, ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις, but ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις is read by Lachmann and Tregelles, as in Jude 12.

‡ See Ewald, *Gesch. des V. Isr.*, v., p. 322; Derembourg, *L'Histoire de la Palestine*, p. 238. This is a common termination of names of sects when

and this being so, it is somewhat strange that our translators should have gone astray on the word, seeing that the Greek form for בנעני, "Canaanite," is invariably spelt correctly with an X corresponding to *Caph*, and not with a K corresponding to *Koph*. The earlier versions, however, all suppose the word to involve the name of a place, though they do not all render it alike. Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Great Bible have "Simon of Cane" or "Cana;" the Geneva Testament (1557) has "of Canan" in the one place, and of "Cane" in the other; the Geneva Bible "Cananite" in both. The Bishops' Bible, so far as I have observed, first prints the word with a double *a* (Matt. x., 4), thus fixing the reference to Canaan.*

Grecized; e. g., Ἀσσιδαῖος, Φαρισαῖος, Σαδδουκαῖος, Ἐσσαῖος (Hegesippus in Euseb., *H. E.*, iv., 23). This fact seems to have escaped Meyer when he points to the termination as showing that Κανανᾶιος denotes the name of a place, and thus exhibits a false tradition, while the true account is preserved in the ζηλωτὴς of St. Luke. Indeed, the formation of Κανανᾶιος from Kanan is exactly analogous to that of Φαρισαῖος from Pharish, or Ἀσσιδαῖος from Hhasid. Meyer confesses himself at a loss to name any place to which he can refer Κανανᾶιος.

In the Peshito Κανανᾶιος is translated ܩܢܢܝܐ, but Χαναναῖος ܟܢܥܢܝܐ, where the difference of the initial letter and the insertion of the ܥ in the latter word show that in this version the forms were not confounded.

* To this list of false derivations some would add κατάνυξις in Rom. xi., 8, where πνεῦμα κατανύξεως is rendered "the spirit of *slumber*," though with the marginal alternative *remorse;* but I doubt whether Archbishop Trench is right in saying (p. 153) that "our translators must have derived κατάνυξις from νυστάζειν, as many others have done." The fact is, that κατανύσσειν, κατάνυξις, are frequently used in the LXX. to translate words denoting heavy sleep, silence, amazement, and the like, e. g., Levit. x., 3; Psa. iv., 5; xxx., 13; xxxv., 15; Isa. vi., 5; Dan. x., 9; and in the very passage to which St. Paul here refers, Isa. xxix., 10, κατάνυξις represents the Hebrew תרדמה, "deep sleep." The idea of *numbness* is the connecting link between *pricking*, *wounding*, and *stupor*, *heavy sleep*. Fritzsche (*Rom.*, ii., p. 558 seq.) has an important excursus on the word, but is not always happy in his explanation of the LXX. renderings. The earlier English versions generally adopted the more literal meaning of κατάνυξις. Thus Wicliffe and the Rheims Version have "compunction," after the Vulgate; Tyndale, Coverdale, and the Great Bible, "unquietness;" the Bishops' Bible, "remorse," with the marginal note, "That is, pricking and unquietnesse of conscience." The Geneva Testament (1557) is as usual the innovator, rendering the word "heavy sleep." For this the Geneva Bible substitutes "slumber," but with a margin "*or* pricking."

There are other passages where, though the word itself will admit the meaning assigned to it in our version, and so this meaning can not be called impossible, yet the context more or less decidedly favors another sense. Examples belonging to this class are James iii., 5, *ἰδοὺ ὀλίγον* [l. *ἡλίκον*] *πῦρ ἡλίκην ὕλην ἀνάπτει*, "Behold how great a *matter* a little fire kindleth," where the literal meaning of *ὕλη* is certainly to be preferred to the philosophical, and where it is most strange that our translators, having the correct word, "wood," present to their minds, should have banished it to the margin; Matt. xxvi., 15, *ἔστησαν αὐτῷ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια*, "They *covenanted with him for* thirty pieces of silver," where the passage in Zechariah (xi., 12, "They *weighed* for my price thirty pieces of silver," LXX. *ἔστησαν*) to which the evangelist alludes ought to have led to the proper rendering of the same word here, "*weighed* unto him;" Heb. ii., 19, *οὐ γὰρ δήπου ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται*, "He *took not on him the nature of* angels, but *he took on him* the seed of Abraham," where the context suggests the more natural meaning of *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι*, "To take hold of for the purpose of supporting or assisting" (comp. ver. 18, *βοηθῆσαι*); Mark iv., 29, *ὅταν παραδοῖ ὁ καρπός*, "When the fruit is *brought forth*," where the right meaning *ripe* is given in the margin; Acts ii., 3, *διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι ὡσεὶ πυρός*, "Cloven tongues as of fire," where the imagery and the symbolism, not less than the tense, suggest a different rendering of *διαμεριζόμεναι*, *parting asunder;* 2 Cor. iv., 4, *εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι* [*αὐτοῖς*] *τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, "Lest the light of the Gospel . . . *should shine* unto them," where indeed the fault was not with the translators, but with the reading, since, having *αὐτοῖς* in their text, they had no choice but to translate the words so; but when *αὐτοῖς* is struck out (as it should be), a different sense ought perhaps to be given to *αὐγάσαι*, "That they might not *behold*

The reasons why I do not class *ἐπιούσιος* among these words, in which a mistaken derivation has led to a wrong translation, will be given in the Appendix.

the light," etc. Another and a very important example of this class of errors is the rendering of παῖς in Acts iii., 13, 26; iv., 27, 30, where it is translated "son" or "child" in place of "servant," thus obliterating the connection with the prophetic announcement of the "servant of the Lord" in Isaiah.* It is not here, as elsewhere, the Sonship, but the ministry, on which the apostles dwell. In Matt. xii., 18, where the prophecy itself (Isa. xlii., 1) is quoted and applied to our Lord, the words are rightly translated, "Behold, I send my *servant*," and, indeed, when confronted with the original, no one would think of rendering it otherwise. Other instances, again, are the rendering of αἴρειν in John i., 29, ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, "Which *taketh away* the sin of the world," where the marginal reading *beareth* should probably be substituted in the text; and similarly of ἀνενεγκεῖν in Heb. ix., 28; 1 Pet. ii., 24, ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας, "To *bear* the sins," where the true idea is not that of sustaining a burden, but of raising upon the cross. So, again, πεπληροφορημένων in Luke i., 1, probably means "fulfilled" rather than "most surely believed," as in the latter sense the passive is used only of the persons convinced, and not of the things credited. On the other hand, it is not certain whether βαστάζειν means "to carry off, to steal," in John xii., 6, τὰ βαλλόμενα ἐβάσταζεν, or whether the English Version "*bare* what was put therein" should stand.

In another class of words, the English rendering, while it can not be called incorrect, is vague or inadequate, so that the exact idea of the original is not represented, or the sharpness of outline is blurred. This defect will be most obvious in metaphors. For instance, in Rom. vi., 13, where ὅπλα ἀδικίας is rendered "*instruments* of unrighteousness" instead of *arms* or *weapons* (which, however, is given as an alternative in the margin), we fail to recognize the image of military service rendered to Sin as a great king (ver. 12, μὴ βασιλευέτω) who enforces obedience (ὑπακούειν) and pays his soldiery in the coin of death (verse 23, τὰ ὀψώνια τῆς ἁμαρτίας θάνατος).

* See especially Trench, *Authorized Version*, p. 95.

Again, the rendering of Col. ii., 5, *ὑμῶν τὴν τάξιν καὶ τὸ στερέωμα τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν πίστεως ὑμῶν*, "Your order and the steadfastness of your faith in Christ," fails to suggest the idea of the close phalanx arrayed for battle which is involved in the original;* and similarly in 2 Cor. x., 5, *πᾶν ὕψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ*, our translators, in rendering the words "Every *high thing that exalteth itself* against the knowledge of God," appear not to have seen that this expression continues the metaphor of the campaign (*στρατευόμεθα*) and the fortresses (*ὀχυρώματα*) in the context, and that the reference is to the siege-works *thrown up* for the purpose of attacking the faith. Again, the metaphor of *καταναρκᾶν* is very inadequately given in 2 Cor. xi., 9, "I was *chargeable to* no man," and in xii., 13, 14, "I was not, I will nòt be, *burdensome to* any one;" and the "*thorn* in the flesh" in the English Version of 2 Cor. xii., 7 has suggested interpretations of St. Paul's malady, which the original *σκόλοψ*, "a *stake*," does not countenance, and is almost as wide of the mark as the Latin *stimulus carnis*, which also has led to much misunderstanding. These are a few instances out of many which might be given where a metaphor has suffered from inadequate rendering.

Other examples also, where no metaphor is involved, might be multiplied. Thus, in Matt. ix., 16; Mark ii., 21, it is difficult to see why our translators should have abandoned the natural expression "undressed cloth," which occurs in the Geneva Testament as a rendering of *ῥάκος ἄγναφον*, for "new cloth," contenting themselves with putting "raw *or* unwrought" in the margin. In Matt. xxvi., 36; Mark xiv., 32, we read in the English Version of "a *place* called Gethsemane;" the Greek, however, is not *χῶρος*, but *χωρίον*; not a place, but "a parcel of ground" (as it is rendered in John iv., 5), an inclosure, a field or garden, and thus corresponds more closely to *κῆπος*, by which St. John describes the same locality, though without mentioning the name (xviii., 1). In Acts i., 3, *ὀπτανόμενος*

* 1 Macc. ix., 14, *εἶδεν Ἰούδας ὅτι Βακχίδης καὶ τὸ στερέωμα τῆς παρεμβολῆς ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς.*

αὐτοῖς should not have been translated "being *seen of* them," for the emphatic word ὀπτάνεσθαι, which does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, expresses much more than this, and "*showing himself unto* them" would be a better, though still an inadequate rendering. In Rom. ii., 22, ὁ βδελυσσόμενος τὰ εἴδωλα ἱεροσυλεῖς, the inconsistency of the man who *plunders a heathen temple* while professing to loathe an idol is lost by the rendering "dost thou *commit sacrilege*;" and indeed it may be suspected that our translators misapprehended the force of ἱεροσυλεῖς, more especially as in most of the earlier versions it was translated "robbest God of his honor." In Acts xiv., 13, "Then the priest of Jupiter which was before the city brought oxen and garlands unto the gates," the English reader inevitably thinks of the city gates; but as the Greek has πυλῶνας, not πύλας, the portal, or gateway, or vestibule of the Temple is clearly meant. This was seen by Tyndale, who quaintly translates it "the church porch." In Acts xvii., 29, St. Paul, addressing an audience of heathen philosophers, condescends to adopt the language familiar to them, and speaks of τὸ θεῖον—an expression which does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament; but in the English rendering "Godhead" this vague philosophical term becomes concrete and precise, as though it had been θεότης in the original. In Acts xiii., 50, and elsewhere, οἱ σεβόμενοι, αἱ σεβόμεναι, by which St. Luke always means "proselytes, worshipers of the one God," are translated "devout;" and hence the strange statement (which must perplex many an English reader) that "the Jews stirred up the devout and honorable women . . . and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas." In 2 Cor. xiii., 11, καταρτίζεσθε is rendered "be *perfect*," and in the 9th verse, τὴν ὑμῶν κατάρτισιν, "your *perfection*;" but the context shows that in these parting injunctions St. Paul reiterates the leading thought of the Epistles, exhorting the Corinthians to *compose their differences*; and this is the meaning of 1 Cor. i., 10, ἦτε δὲ κατηρτισμένοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοΐ, where it is better rendered "that ye be *perfectly joined together*, etc." Lastly,

in 1 Tim. iii., 3; Tit. i., 7, *μὴ πάροινον* is translated "not given to wine;" but in the first passage this idea is already expressed by *νηφάλιον*, and, natural as the more obvious rendering might seem, the usage of *πάροινος* elsewhere shows that it denotes "a brawler," "a *quarrelsome* person" (which is the alternative meaning offered in the margin).

I will close this section with an illustration, of which it is difficult to say whether we should more properly class it under the head of lexicography or of grammar. *Σάββατα* is the Aramaic form of the Hebrew word for "a sabbath" written out in Greek letters. Appearing in this form, it is naturally declined as a plural, *σάββατα*, *σαββάτων*, but nevertheless retains its proper meaning as a singular. How widely this form was known, and how strictly it preserved its force as a singular, will appear from Horace's "Hodie tricesima sabbata." In our version of the New Testament, whenever the meaning is unmistakable it is translated as a singular (e. g., Matt. xii., 1, 11; Mark i., 21; ii., 23; iii., 2; Acts xiii., 14); but where the sense is doubtful a plural rendering is mostly preferred (e. g., Matt. xii., 5, 10, 12; Mark iii., 4). In all these cases, however, it is much better treated as a singular, in accordance with the sense which it bears in the same contexts; and in such a passage as Col. ii., 16, *ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς ἢ νεομηνίας ἢ σαββάτων*, the plural "sabbath-days" is obviously out of place, as co-ordinated with two singular nouns. The only passage in the New Testament where *σάββατα* is distinctly plural is Acts xvii., 2, *ἐπὶ σάββατα τρία*, where it is defined by the numeral.

§ 6.

Over and above the ordinary questions of translation, there is a particular class of words which presents special difficulties and needs special attention. Proper names, official titles, technical terms, which, as belonging to one language and one nation, have no direct equivalents in another, must obviously be treated in an exceptional way. Are they to be reproduced

as they stand in the original, or is the translator to give the terms most nearly corresponding to them in the language of his version? Is he to adopt the policy of despair, or the policy of compromise? Or may he invoke either principle according to the exigencies of the case? and, if so, what laws can be laid down to regulate his practice and to prevent caprice?

Of this class of words, *proper names* are the least difficult to deal with; and yet even these occasionally offer perplexing problems.

The general principles on which our translators proceeded in this matter are twofold. *First*, where no familiar English form of a name existed, they retained the form substantially as they found it. In other words they reproduced the Hebrew or Chaldee form in the Old Testament, and the Greek in the New. *Secondly*, where a proper name had been adopted into the English language, and become naturalized there with some modification of form, or where the person or place was commonly known in English by a name derived from some other language, they adopted this English equivalent, however originated. Instances of English equivalents arrived at by the one process are Eve, Herod, James, John, Jude, Luke, Magdalene, Mary, Peter, Pilate, Saul, Stephen, Zebedee, Italy, Rome, etc.; of the other, Assyria, Ethiopia, Euphrates, Idumea, Mesopotamia, Persia, Syria, etc., Artaxerxes, Cyrus, Darius, etc., for Asshur, Cush, Phrath, Edom, Aram-Naharaim, Pharas, Aram, etc., Arta-chshashta, Coresh, Daryavesh, etc., in the Old Testament,* the more familiar classical forms being substituted for the less familiar Hebrew; and of Diana, Jupiter, Mercurius, for Artemis, Zeus, Hermes, in the New, the more familiar Latin being substituted for the less familiar

* In this, however, there is great inconsistency. Thus we have Cush in Isa. xi., 11, but Ethiopia in xviii., 1, etc.; Edom in Isa. xi., 14; lxiii., 1, but Idumea in xxxiv., 5, 6; Asshur in Hos. xiv., 4, but Assyria elsewhere in this same prophet; Javan in Isa. lxvi., 19, but Greece or Grecia in the other prophets; and so with other words.

Greek; while in some few cases, e.g., Egypt, Tyre,* etc., both modifying influences have been at work; the Hebrew has been replaced by the Greek, and this, again, has been Anglicized in form. In the instructions given to our translators it was so ordered: "The names of the prophets and the holy writers, with the other names of the text, to be retained as nigh as may be, according as they were vulgarly used."

With these principles no fault can be found; but the result of their application is not always satisfactory. Our translators are not uniformly consistent with themselves; and, moreover, time has very considerably altered the conditions of the problem as it presents itself now.

(1.) The *first* of these principles, though it commends itself to our own age, was not allowed to pass unquestioned when first asserted. At the era of the Reformation, the persons mentioned in the Old Testament were commonly known (so far as they were known at all) through the Septuagint and Vulgate forms. Thus Ochosias stood for Ahaziah, Achab for Ahab, Sobna for Shebnah, Elias for Elijah, Eliseus for Elisha, Roboam for Rehoboam, Josaphat for Jehoshaphat, Abdias for Obadiah, and the like. In Coverdale's Bible these forms are generally retained; but in the later English versions there is a tendency to substitute the Hebrew forms, or forms more nearly approaching to them.

In the two versions which held the ground when our Authorized Version was set on foot—the Bishops' Bible and the Geneva Bible—this tendency had reached the utmost limit which the English language seemed to allow. In Münster's Latin Bible, indeed, an attempt had been made to reproduce the Hebrew forms with exactness, and, accordingly, the names of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel there appear as Jesahiahu, Irmeiahu, and Iechezchel. This extreme point, however, was never reached by any of our English translators; but still, in the Geneva Bible, the names of the patriarchs are written

* Yet "Tyre" and "Tyrus" are employed indifferently, and without any rule, in the Old Testament.

Izhak and Iaakob, and in the Bishops' Bible we meet with such forms as Amariahu, Zachariahu.

This tendency was not left unassailed. Gregory Martin, in his attack on the "English Bibles used and authorized since the time of the schism," published at Rheims in 1582, writes as follows:

Of one thing we can by no means excuse you, but it must savor vanity or novelty, or both. As when you affect new strange words which the people are not acquainted withal, but it is rather Hebrew to them than English: *μάλα σεμνῶς ὀνομάζοντες*, as Demosthenes speaketh, uttering with great countenance and majesty. "Against him came up Nabuchadnezzar, king of Babel," 2 Par. xxxvi., 6, for "Nabuchodonosor, king of Babylon;" "Saneherib" for "Sennacherib;" "Michaiah's prophecy" for "Michæa's;" "Jehoshaphat's prayer" for "Josaphat's;" "Uzza slain" for "Oza;" "when Zerubbabel went about to build the Temple" for "Zorobabel;" "remember what the Lord did to Miriam" for "Marie," Deut. xxxiv.; and in your first* translation "Elisa" for "Elisæus;" "Pekahia" and "Pekah" for "Phaceia" and "Phacee;" "Uziahu" for "Ozias;" "Thiglath-peleser" for "Teglath-phalasar;" "Ahaziahu" for "Ochozias;" "Peka, son of Remaliahu," for "Phacee, son of Romelia." And why say you not as well "Shelomoh" for "Salomoh," and "Coresh" for "Cyrus," and so alter every word from the known sound and pronunciation thereof? Is this to teach the people when you speak Hebrew rather than English? Were it goodly hearing (think you) to say for "Jesus," "Jeshuah;" and for "Marie," his mother, "Miriam;" and for "Messias," "Messiach;" and "John," "Jachannan;" and such-like monstrous novelties? which you might as well do, and the people would understand you as well, as when your preachers say "Nabucadnezer, king of Babel."

To these charges Fulke gives this brief and sensible reply:

Seeing the most of the proper names of the Old Testament were unknown to the people before the Scriptures were read in English, it was best to utter them according to the truth of their pronunciation in Hebrew rather than after the common corruption which they had received in the Greek and Latin tongues. But as for those names which were known to the people out of the New Testament, as Jesus,

* *i. e.*, The Great Bible, which was the first Bible in use after "the schism;" the edition to which Martin refers is that of 1562. The two Bibles to which Martin's strictures mostly apply are the Genevan and the Bishops', as being most commonly used when he wrote. See Fulke's *Defence*, etc., p. 67 seq.

John, Mary, etc., it had been folly to have taught men to sound them otherwise than after the Greek declination, in which we find them.*

The attack, however, was so far successful, that the revisers who produced our Authorized translation seem to have adopted in each case from the current versions those forms which least offended the English eye or ear, even though farther removed from the Hebrew. Thus, in the examples already given, they write Isaac, Jacob, in preference to Izhak, Iaakob of the Geneva Bible, and Amariah, Zachariah in preference to Amariahu, Zachariahu of the Bishops'.

With the general treatment of the Old Testament names I have no desire to find fault: perhaps the forms in our English Bible approach as nearly to the Hebrew as is desirable. But, when we compare the New Testament with the Old, some important questions arise.

In favor of retaining the old Septuagint and Vulgate forms in preference to introducing the Hebrew, there was this strong argument — that the same person thus appeared under the same name in the New Testament as in the Old. The English reader did not need to be informed that Eliseus was the same as Elisha, Ozias as Uzziah, Salathiel as Shealtiel, etc. Now he has not this advantage. Even supposing that the identity of persons is recognized, much unconscious misconception still remains in particular cases. It is very difficult, for instance, for an English reader, who has not read or thought on the subject, to realize the fact that the Elias whom the Jews expected to appear in Messiah's days was not some weird mythical being, or some merely symbolical person, but the veritable Elijah who lived on earth, in flesh and blood, in the days of Ahab. "Let us just seek to realize to ourselves," says Archbishop Trench, "the difference in the amount of awakened attention among a country congregation which Matt. xvii., 10 would create if it were read thus: 'And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the Scribes that

* Fulke's *Defence of the English Translations of the Bible*, p. 588 seq. (Parker Society's edition).

*Elijah* must first come?' as compared with what it now is likely to create." And this argument applies, though in a less degree, to the scene of the transfiguration. It is most important, as the same writer has observed, to "keep vivid and strong the relations between the Old and New Testament in the minds of the great body of English hearers and readers of Scripture."*

I imagine that few would deny the advantage of substituting the more familiar Old Testament names in such cases for the less familiar Septuagint forms preserved in the New; but many more may question whether such a substitution is legitimate, and I venture therefore to add a few words in defence of this reform which I should wish to see introduced.

If at this point we were to invoke the second principle (which has been mentioned above and will be considered presently), that whenever a familiar English form of a name occurs, this shall be substituted for the original, e. g., John for Ioannes, James for Iacobos, Mary for Mariam, this principle alone would justify the change which I am advocating. For, to our generation at least, the familiar English names of the Old Testament personages are Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, etc., and therefore, on this ground alone, the Greek forms Elias, Eliseus, Esaias, should give place to them. In the 16th and 17th centuries it might be a question between Esay, Esaie, Esaias, Isaiah; between Abdy, Abdias, Obadiah; between Jeremy, Jeremias, Jeremiah; between Osee, Oseas, Osea, Hosea (or Hoshea); between Sophony, Sophonia, Sophonias, Zephaniah; between Aggeus, Haggeus, Haggai, and the like; but now long familiarity has decided irrevocably in favor of the last forms in each case, and there is every reason why the less familiar modes of representing the names should give place to the more familiar. But, quite independently of this consideration of familiarity, we should merely be exercising the legitimate functions of translators if in most cases we were to return to the Old Testament forms; for (with very few ex-

* *Authorized Version*, p. 66.

ceptions) the Greek forms represent the original names as nearly as the vocables and the genius of the Greek language permit, and in translating it is surely allowable to neglect the purely Greek features in the words. This applies especially to terminations, such as Jeremias, Jonas, Manasses, for Jeremiah, Jonah, Manasseh; and, in fact, the name Elias itself is nothing more than "Elijah" similarly formed, for the Hebrew word could not have been written otherwise in Greek. It applies also to the change of certain consonants. Thus a Greek had no choice but to represent the *sh* sound by a simple *s*. Like the men of Ephraim, the Greeks could not frame to pronounce the word Shibboleth right; and it is curious to observe to what straits the Alexandrian translator of the narrative in the book of Judges (xii., 5, 6) is driven in his attempt to render the incident into this language.* Remembering this, we shall at once replace Cis (Acts xiii., 21) by Kish,† and Aser (Luke ii., 36; Rev. vii., 6) by Asher; while the English reader will at length discover that the unfamiliar Saron, connected with the history of Æneas (Acts ix., 35), is the well-known Sharon of Old Testament history. Combining this principle of change with the foregoing, we should restore Elisha in place of Eliseus. For the Hebrew gutturals again the Greeks had no equivalent, and were obliged either to omit them, or to substitute the nearest sound which their language afforded. On this principle they frequently represented the final ה by an ε;‡ and hence the forms Core, Noe, which therefore we should without scruple replace by the more familiar Korah, Noah. In the middle of a word it was often represented by a χ, which our Old Testament translators in this and other positions give an *h;* and thus there is

* He can only say *εἰπὸν δὴ στάχυς* [A has *εἴπατε δὴ σύνθημα*]· *καὶ οὐ κατεύθυνε* [A *καὶ κατηύθυναν*] *τοῦ λαλῆσαι οὕτως.*

† It is not easy to see why our translators should have written Cis, Core, rather than Kis, Kore.

‡ The genealogies at the beginning of the Books of Chronicles in the LXX. offer very many instances of this change. Sometimes this final ε represents an ע or a ה.

no reason why Rachab, Achaz, should stand in the New Testament for Rahab, Ahaz in the Old. Again, the fact that the aspirate, though pronounced, was never written in Greek, should be taken into account, and any divergence from the Hebrew form which can be traced to this cause might be neglected; thus Agar, Ezekias, would be replaced by Hagar, Hezekiah, and Josaphat, Roboam, by Jehoshaphat, Rehoboam.* By adopting this principle of neglecting mere peculiarities and imperfections of the Greek in the representation of the Hebrew names, and thus endeavoring to reproduce the original form which has undergone the modification, we should, in almost every important instance, bring the names in the Old and New Testament into conformity with each other. A very few comparatively trifling exceptions would still remain, where the Greek form can not be so explained. These might be allowed to stand; or, if the identity of the person signified was beyond question (e. g., Aram and Ram), the Old Testament form might be replaced in the text, and the Greek form given in the margin.

(2.) The *second* of the two principles which were enunciated above as guiding our English translators also requires some consideration.

Under this head the *inconsistency* of our Authorized Version will need correction, for it is incapable of defense. If the prophet was to be called Osee† in the New Testament

* For Ῥαάβ (Heb. xi., 31; James ii., 25) our translators have boldly written "Rahab." While speaking of aspirates, it may be mentioned that in the edition of 1611 the normal spelling in the New Testament is "Hierusalem;" the only exceptions which I have noticed being 1 Cor. xvi., 3; Gal. i., 17, 18; ii., 1; iv., 25, 26; Heb. xii., 22, and the headings of some chapters (e. g., Acts xxi.; Rev. xxi.), where "Ierusalem" appears. On the other hand, in the Old Testament it is "Ierusalem," though "Hierusalem" occurs in the heading of 2 Sam. xiv.

† It may be questioned whether this word should be pronounced as a dissyllable, the double *e* being regarded as an English termination, as in Zebedee, Pharisee, etc., or as a trisyllable, the word being considered as a reproduction of the Greek Ὡσηέ.

On the other hand, there can, I think, be no doubt that the modern fashion of pronouncing the final *e* of Magdalene, as though it represented the η of the

(Rom. ix., 26), there is no reason why he should have remained Hosea in the Old. If the country appears as Greece in Zechariah (ix., 13) and in the Acts (xx., 2), why should it be named Grecia in the book of Daniel (viii., 21; x., 20; xi., 2)? If the inhabitants of this country are Greeks in the New Testament, why should they be Grecians in the Old (Joel iii., 6)?* If Mark is substituted for Marcus in some passages (Acts xii., 12, 25; 2 Tim. iv., 11), why should Marcus have been allowed to stand in others (Col. iv., 10; Philem. 24; 1 Pet. v., 13)? Nay, so far does this inconsistency go, that Jeremy and Jeremias occur in the same Gospel (Matt. ii., 17; xvi., 14); Luke and Lucas in two companion epistles sent at the same time, from the same place, and to the same destination (Col. iv., 14; Philem. 24); and Timothy and Timotheus in the same chapter of the same epistle (2 Cor. i., 1, 19). In all these cases, the form which is *now* the most familiar should be consistently adopted. This rule would substitute Jeremiah for Jeremy, but, on the other hand, it would prefer Mark to Marcus. At the same time, both Cretes (Acts ii., 11) and Cretians (Tit. i., 12) would disappear, and Cretans take their place.

original, is erroneous. The word is far older than the translations made from the Greek in the 16th and 17th centuries, and came from the Latin. Though in the A.V. (1611) the spelling is always "Magdalene," yet in the earlier versions it is indifferently Magdalen and Magdalene. Wicliffe writes it "Mawdeleyn"—a pronunciation which has survived in the names of our colleges and in the adjective "maudlin." There is no more reason for sounding the last letter in Magdalene than in Urbane (Rom. xvi., 9).

This last word is printed "Urbane" in all the early editions of the A.V. which I have consulted (1611, 1612, 1617, 1629, 1630, 1637). On the other hand, the earlier versions, without exception, so far as I have noticed, have "Urban" or "Urbanus." In the Authorized Version (1611) these final *e*'s were common; thus we find Hebrewe, Jewe, Marke, Romane, Samaritane, etc.

* In the New Testament "Grecian" is reserved for Ἑλληνιστής, while "Greek" represents Ἕλλην. This distinction is good as far as it goes; but, in order to convey any idea to an English reader, Ἑλληνιστὴς should be translated by "Grecian Jew" or by some similar phrase.

As Ἕλλην is translated "Gentile" without hesitation elsewhere (e. g., 1 Cor. x., 32; xii., 13), it is strange that this rendering is not adopted for Ἑλληνίς, where it would have avoided an apparent contradiction, Mark vii., 26, "A Greek, a Syrophenician by nation."

This principle, if consistently carried out, would rule one very important example. Familiar usage, which requires that the name JESUS should be retained when it designates the most sacred Person of all, no less imperatively demands that *Joshua* shall be substituted when the great captain of Israel and conqueror of Palestine is intended. For the same reason, we speak of the patriarch as *Jacob* and the apostle as *James;* of the sister of Moses as *Miriam*, and the mother of the Lord as *Mary.* It so happens that both the passages in which the name Jesus designates the Israelite captain (Acts vii., 45; Heb. iv., 8) are more or less obscure either from difficulties in the context or from defects of translation; and the endless confusion which is created in the minds of the uneducated by the retention of this form is a matter of every-day experience.

This last example leads me to speak of another point. There can be little doubt that, when the same person is intended, the same form should be adopted throughout. But what should be done when the name which has a familiar English form applies to unfamiliar persons? Thus the English *John* corresponds to the Greek Ἰωάνης or Ἰωάννης, and to the Hebrew *Jehohanan* or *Johanan* (יהוחנן or יוחנן). Are we then, in every case, to substitute John where either the Greek or the Hebrew form occurs? No one would think of displacing John the Baptist, or John the son of Zebedee, or John surnamed Mark. But what are we to do with the Old Testament personages bearing this name? What with those who are mentioned in St. Luke's genealogy, where apparently the name occurs more than once in forms more or less disguised (iii., 24 (?), 27, 30)? What with John i., 43; xxi., 15, 16, 17, where our English Version gives "Simon, son of Jona," but where the true reading in the original is doubtless Ἰωάνου? I do not know that any universal rule can be laid down; but probably the practice, adopted by our translators, of reproducing the name when it occurs in the Hebrew form, and translating it when in the Greek, would be generally ap-

proved. Yet perhaps an exception might be made of John i., 43; xxi., 15, 16, 17, where it is advisable either in the text or in the margin to show the connection of form with the Βαριωνᾶ of Matt. xvi., 17.* Again, in the English Version there is the greatest confusion in the forms of another name, *Judah*, *Judas*, *Juda*, *Jude*. Thus the patriarch is called both *Juda* and *Judah* in the same context (Heb. vii., 14; viii., 8), and *Judas* and *Juda* in parallel narratives (Matt. i., 2, 3; Luke iii., 33); and, again, the brother of Jesus is called *Judas* in one evangelist (Matt. xiii., 55), and *Juda* in another (Mark vi., 3). The principle of familiarity suggests *Jude* for the writer of the epistle; *Judah* for the patriarch, and the tribe and country named from him; and *Judas* for Iscariot and for the other less known persons bearing the name; while Juda, which occurs for the patriarch or tribe (Luke iii., 33; Heb. vii., 14; Rev. v., 5; vii., 5) and the country (Matt. ii., 6; Luke i., 39), as well as for other unknown persons (Luke iii., 26 (?),

* This form Ἰωνᾶ may represent two distinct Hebrew names: (1.) יוֹנָה, "A dove," the prophet's name, Jonah: (2.) יוֹחָנָן, "The grace of Jehovah," Johanan or John. This last is generally written Ἰωανάν or Ἰωάνης (the form Ἰωάννης with the double *ν* has inferior support). Contracted it becomes Ἰωνάν or Ἰωνά, the first *α* being liable to be slurred over in pronunciation, because the Hebrew accent falls on the last syllable. For Ἰωνάν, see 1 Chron. xii., 12 (A, Ιωαν ℵ); xxvi., 3 (A); Neh. vi., 18 (B); Ezra x., 6 (ℵ corr. from Ιωαναν); 1 Esdr. ix., 1 (B); Luke iii., 27 (v. l.); iii., 30 (v. l.); for Ἰωνά, 2 Kings xxv., 23 (B); Luke iii., 30 (v. l.). Thus the *υἱὸς Ἰωάνου* of St. John is equivalent to the Βαριωνᾶ of St. Matthew. The longer form of the name of St. Peter's father was preserved also in the Gospel of the Hebrews, as we learn from a marginal note in an early cursive MS. (see Tischendorf, *Notit. Cod. Sin.*, p. 58) on Matt. xvi., 17, Βαριωνᾶ τὸ Ἰουδαϊκὸν υἱὲ Ἰωάννου; and in an extant fragment inserted in the Latin translation of Origen, *in Matt.* xix., 19 (iii., p. 671 seq., ed. Delarue), but omitted in the Greek, we read "Simon fili Joanne, facilius est camelum, etc." From not understanding that the two are forms of the same name, some harmonizer devised the statement which we find in a list of apostles preserved in the Paris MSS. Reg. 1789, 1026 (quoted by Cotelier, *Patr. Apost.*, i., p. 275), Πέτρος καὶ Ἀνδρέας ἀδελφοί, ἐκ πατρὸς Ἰωνᾶ, μητρὸς Ἰωαννᾶ, or, as it is otherwise read, ἐκ πατρὸς Ἰωάννου, μητρὸς Ἰωνᾶς. Our Lord seems to allude to the meaning of the word in Matt. xvi., 17, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar Jona (Son of the Grace of God), for flesh and blood did not reveal it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." There is probably a similar allusion in all the passages in St. John.

30), ought to disappear wholly. And, so far as regards Judah and Judas, it would be well to follow this principle; but when the name is used of the author of the epistle, though Jude might (if it were thought fit) be retained in the title, yet Judas should be substituted for Jude in the opening verse, so as not to preclude the identification of this person with the Lord's brother (which is highly probable), or again with his namesake in St. Luke's lists of the apostles (which has commended itself to many).

An error greater than any hitherto mentioned is the rendering of the female name Euodia (Εὐοδίαν, Phil. iv., 2) by the masculine Euodias;* while conversely it seems probable that we should render the name Ἰουνίαν, one of St. Paul's kinsfolk, who was "noted among the apostles" (Rom. xvi., 7), by Junias (*i. e.*, Junianus), not Junia.†

Whether, in certain cases, a name should be retained or translated, will be a matter of question; but no defense can be offered for the inconsistency of retaining "Areopagus" in Acts xvii., 19, and rendering it "Mars' hill" three verses below. Nor, again, is there any reason why κρανίου τόπος should be translated "A (or the) place of a skull" in three gospels (Matt. xxvii., 33; Mark xv., 22; John xix., 17), and ὁ τόπος ὁ καλούμενος κρανίον, "The place which is called *Calvary*," in the fourth (Luke xxiii., 33).† In all places where it is possible, the practice of rendering seems to be preferable; and by the "Three Taverns" a fresh touch is added to the picture of St. Paul's journey (Acts xxviii., 15), which would have been yet more vivid if consistently therewith our translators had rendered Ἀππίου Φόρου, "The Market of Appius," as it stands in the Geneva Version.‡

* See above, p. 114.

† The word "Jewry," which was common in the older versions for Judah or Judæa, has almost disappeared in the Authorized Version of the New Testament, but still remains in two passages (Luke xxiii., 5; John vii., 1). In Dan. v., 13, "The children of the captivity of Judah, whom the king my father brought out of Jewry," the same word in the original is rendered both "Judah" and "Jewry."

‡ Another fault is the rendering both Φοίνιξ, the haven of Crete (Acts

The question between reproduction and translation becomes more important when we turn from proper names to official titles and technical terms, such as weights, measures, and the like. In the Old Testament our translators have frequently adopted the former principle, *e. g.*, bath, cor, ephah, etc.; in the New they almost universally adhere to the latter.

In a version which aims at being popular rather than literary, the latter course seems to be amply justified.* Yet, when the principle is conceded, the application is full of difficulty. The choice very often lies between giving a general expression which conveys no very definite idea, and adopting some technical term which is precise enough to the English ear, but suggests a conception more or less at variance with the original.

How, for instance, are we to treat ἀνθύπατος? Wicliffe reproduced the Latin "proconsul." The earlier versions of the Reformed Church generally give "ruler of the county," "ruler." The Authorized Version adopts the rendering of the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles, "deputy of the country," "deputy." This last has now nothing to recommend it. In the 16th

xxvii., 12), and Φοινίκη, the country of Phœnicia (Acts xi., 19; xv., 3), by the same word "Phenice" (after the Bishops' and Geneva Bibles), while conversely Φοινίκη has two different renderings, "Phenice" (xi., 19; xv., 3) and "Phenicia" (xxi., 2). The older versions generally, as late as the Great Bible, have "Phenices" or "Phenyces" for both words. Did our translators intend the final *e* of "Phenice," when it represents Phœnix, to be mute, on the analogy of Beatrix, Beatrice?

* At all events, whichever course is adopted, it should be carried out consistently. Thus there is no reason why Ῥαββί should be sometimes reproduced in the English Version (Matt. xxiii., 7, 8; John i., 39, 50; iii., 2, 26; vi., 25) and sometimes rendered "Master" (Matt. xxvi., 25, 49; Mark ix., 5; xi., 21; xiv., 45; John iv., 31; ix., 2; xi., 8), or in like manner why Ῥαββουνί, which only occurs twice, should be once translated "Lord" (Mark x., 51) and once retained (John xx., 16).

In the same way the word πάσχα, which is generally rendered "Passover," is represented once, and only once, by "Easter" (Acts xii., 4). This is a remnant of the earlier versions in which πάσχα is commonly translated so, even in such passages as Luke xxii., 1, ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων ἡ λεγομένη πάσχα, "which is called Easter," where, however, the Geneva and Bishops' Bibles substitute "Passover."

century, when the lord lieutenant of Ireland was styled deputy, the word would convey a sufficiently precise idea; but now it suggests a wrong conception, if it suggests any at all. What sense, for instance, can an English reader attach to the words "The law is open, and there are *deputies*" (Acts xix., 38), which in the Authorized Version are given as the rendering of *ἀγόραιοι ἄγονται* καὶ ἀνθύπατοί εἰσιν*? The term which in the 19th century corresponds most nearly to the *deputy* of 16th is *lieutenant governor*, and indeed the Geneva Testament did in one passage (Acts xviii., 12) translate *ἀνθύπατος* by "lieutenant of the country," but this rendering was dropped in the Geneva Bible, and not taken up again. To this precise language, however, exception might be taken; and if so, we should be obliged to fall back on some general term, such as "governor," "chief magistrate," or the like. With the rendering of *γραμματεύς*, "town clerk," in Acts xix., 35, I should not be disposed to find fault, for it is difficult to suggest a more exact equivalent. In the context of the same passage, however (ver. 31), an English reader would not understand that the "*chiefs* of Asia" were officers appointed to preside at the festivals, and perhaps "*presidents* of Asia" might be substituted with advantage (for the word occurs in the English Bible), though it is impossible entirely to remove an obscurity which exists also in the Greek Ἀσιάρχης. In Rom. xvi., 23, the substitution of "treasurer" for "chamberlain" in the rendering of *ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως* would be an improvement;† for "treasurer," again, is a good Biblical word, and we do not use "chamberlain" to describe such an officer as is here intended.‡

* Why the slovenly translation, "the law is open," should have been allowed to remain, it is difficult to see. In the margin our translators suggest "the court days are kept." They would have earned our gratitude if in this and other cases they had acted with more boldness, and placed in the text the more correct renderings which they have been content to suggest in the margin.

† Wicliffe has "treasurer," the Rheims Version "cofferer," while the versions of the Reformed Church render it "chamberlain."

‡ Perhaps I ought to except the Chamberlain of the City of London.

On the whole, however, the rendering of official titles in our version is fairly adequate, and can not be much improved. If there is occasionally some inconsistency and want of method, as, for instance, when χιλίαρχος is translated "chief captain," and ἑκατόνταρχος reproduced as "centurion" in the same context* (Acts xxi., 31, 32; xxii., 24–26; xxiii., 17–23), still these renderings have established a prescriptive right, and an adequate reason must be shown for disturbing them. In Acts xvi., 35, 38, ῥαβδοῦχοι, "lictors," is well rendered "sergeants;" and in xxviii., 16, the translation of στρατοπεδάρχης, the *præfectus prætorio*, as "captain of the guard," is a great improvement on the less precise renderings of the earlier versions; "chief captain of the host" (Tyndale, Great Bible, Bishops'), "chief captain" (Coverdale), "general captain" (Geneva); and, with the addition of one word, might very well stand, "chief captain (or captain general) of the guard." On the other hand, in Mark vi., 27, σπεκουλάτωρ, which signifies "a soldier of the guard," should not have been rendered "executioner" (in the earlier versions it is "hangman"), for this term describes a mere accident of his office.

But if official titles are, on the whole, fairly rendered, this is not the case with another class of technical terms denoting coins, weights, and measures.

As regards coins, the smaller pieces are more adequately translated than the larger. No better rendering than "mite" is possible for λεπτόν, or than "farthing" for κοδράντης, "quadrans;" and the relation of the two coins is thus preserved (Mark xii., 42, λεπτὰ δύο, ὅ ἐστιν κοδράντης). But from this point the inadequacy and inconsistency begin. Why ἀσσάριον, the late Greek diminutive used for the *as*, of which, therefore, the κοδράντες is a fourth part, should still be translated a *farthing*† (which elsewhere represents κοδράντης) rather than a *penny*,

* Some of the older versions translate the words "upper" or "high captain," and "under captain," respectively.

† In Matt. x., 29, the Geneva Testament (1557) had rendered ἀσσάριον by a *halfpenny* (as Wicliffe), and similarly δύο ἀσσάρια, in Luke xii., 6, by a *penny*. The rest give it a farthing, as in the A.V.

it is difficult to see (Matt. x., 29; Luke xii., 6). And, as we advance in the scale, the disproportion between the value of the original coin and the English substitute increases. Thus the *denarius*, a silver piece of the value originally of ten and afterward of sixteen ases, is always rendered a *penny*. Its absolute value, as so much weight in metal, is as nearly as possible the same as the French franc. Its relative value as a purchasing power, in an age and a country where provisions were much cheaper, was considerably more. Now it so happens that in almost every case where the word δηνάριον occurs in the New Testament it is connected with the idea of a *liberal* or *large* amount, and yet in these passages the English rendering names a sum which is absurdly small. Thus the Good Samaritan, whose generosity is intended to appear throughout, on leaving, takes out "two pence," and gives them to the innkeeper to supply the farther wants of the wounded man. Thus, again, the owner of the vineyard, whose liberality is contrasted with the niggardly, envious spirit, the "evil eye" of others, gives, as a day's wages, a penny to each man. It is unnecessary to ask what impression the mention of this sum will leave on the minds of an uneducated peasant or shopkeeper of the present day. Even at the time when our version was made, and when wages were lower, it must have seemed wholly inadequate.* The inadequacy again appears, though not so prominently, in the two hundred pence, the sum named as insufficient to supply bread to the five thousand (Mark vi., 37; John vi., 7), and similarly in other cases (*e. g.*, Mark xiv., 5; John xii., 5; Luke vii., 41). Lastly, in the Book of the Revelation (vi., 6), the announcement, which in the original implies famine prices, is rendered in our

* The rendering "a penny" was probably handed down in this familiar parable from the time when this sum would be no inadequate remuneration for a day's labor; but long before the Versions of the Reformed Church were made, this had ceased to be the case. Even in Henry the VIIIth's reign a laborer earned from sixpence to eightpence a day (Froude, i., p. 29 seq.), though after the Restoration the rate of wages does not seem to have advanced much upon this amount (see Macaulay, i , p. 413).

English Version "A measure of wheat for a penny, and three measures of barley for a penny." The fact is that the word χοῖνιξ, here translated "measure," falls below the amount of a quart, while the word δηνάριον, here translated "a penny," approaches toward the value of a shilling. To the English reader the words must convey the idea of enormous plenty.* Another word, *drachma*, occurs in the parable of the lost money in St. Luke xv., 8, 9, where it is translated *piece of silver*. Yet the Greek drachma is so nearly equal in value to the Roman denarius, that it may be questioned whether the same coin is not meant by both terms;† and, if *piece of silver* or *silver piece* is a reasonable translation of drachma, it might very well be employed to render denarius. Again, in the incident relating to the tribute-money (Matt. xvii., 24 seq.), mention is made of two different coins or sums of money, the *didrachma* and the *stater*, the latter being double of the former; and this relation of value is important, and should have been preserved if possible, because it explains our Lord's words, "Take it (the stater), and give unto them *for me and for thee*." In our version, however, didrachma is rendered "tribute-money, tribute," and stater "a piece of money." Of larger amounts, *mina* (μνᾶ) is translated a "pound" in one parable (Luke xix., 13),‡ while in two others (Matt. xviii., 24 seq.; xxv., 14 seq.) *talent* is allowed to stand. From the latter of these comes the secondary metaphorical sense of the

* A "measure" in some parts of England is or was equivalent to a Winchester bushel. At all events, it would suggest a large rather than a small quantity.

† See Plin., *N. H.*, xxi., 109: "Drachma Attica denarii argentei habet pondus." This parable does not occur in St. Matthew and St. Mark, and must have been derived by St. Luke from some independent source. Hence, as addressing Greek readers chiefly, he would not unnaturally name a Greek coin in preference. Similarly it was seen above (p. 102) that ὀρυνή is confined to St. Luke in that portion of his narrative which does not run parallel with the other two evangelists.

‡ The Wicliffite Versions have "besaunt" for μνᾶ here; but the carelessness with which the word is used appears from the fact that they employ it also to render *drachma* on the one hand (Luke xv., 8), and *talentum* on the other (Matt. xviii., 24 [v. l.]; xxv., 16).

word "talent," which has entirely superseded the literal meaning in common language.

The treatment of measures, again, is extremely loose. The *μετρητής*, indeed, is fairly rendered "firkin" in John ii., 6; and the *modius* appears as "bushel" (Matt. v., 15; Mark iv., 21; Luke xi., 33), where the English measure, though greatly in excess of the Latin, which is about a peck, may nevertheless remain undisturbed, since nothing depends on exactness. With these exceptions, the one word "measure" is made to do duty for all the terms which occur in the original. Thus, in Rev. vi., 6, already quoted, it stands for a *χοῖνιξ*, something under a quart; and in other passages it represents not less than three Hebrew measures, the *σάτον*, or seah (Matt. xiii., 33; Luke xiii., 21), the *βάτος*, the bath, or ephah, and the *κόρος*, the cor or homer (both in Luke xvi., 6, 7), though the seah is one third of the bath, and the bath one tenth of the cor. In the former of these two passages from the Gospels accuracy is unimportant, for the "three measures of meal" in the parable will tell their tale equally, whatever may be the contents of the measure; though even here we may regret that our translators deserted the more precise "peck," which they found in some of the older versions. But in Luke xvi., 6, 7, where the *bath* and the *cor* are mentioned in the same context, they should certainly be distinguished. The *κόροι σίτου* might very well be rendered "*quarters* of wheat" with Tyndale and several of the older versions. For the *βάτοι ἐλαίου* it is more difficult to find an equivalent: Wicliffe renders *βάτους* by "barrels;" the Rheims Version by "pipes." In Rev. vi., 6, it is still more important to aim at precision, because the extremity of the famine only appears when the proper relation between the measure and the price is preserved. Here *χοῖνιξ* might very well be translated "a quart."

§ 7.

This discussion has been occupied hitherto with questions affecting the correctness of our version as representing the

Greek. It remains to consider the English in itself, as a literary production rather than as a translation, and to ask how far it is capable of amendment from this point of view.

And here I certainly am not disposed to dissent from the universal verdict, in which those least disposed to stubborn conservatism have most heartily concurred, and which has been reasserted only the more emphatically since the question of revision was started; but those who, having studied our English Version most carefully, and therefore have entered most fully into its singular merits, will be the least disposed to deny that here and there the reviser's hand may be employed with advantage.

Under this head the *archaisms* demand to be considered first. Whatever may have been the feeling in generations past, there is no disposition in the present age to alter the character of our version. The stately rhythm and the archaic coloring are alike sacred in the eyes of all English-speaking peoples. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that our version addresses itself not to archæologists and critics, but to plain folk; and these two considerations combined should guide the pen of the reviser. So long as an archaism is intelligible, let it by all means be retained. If it is misleading, or ambiguous, or inarticulate, the time for removing it has come.

As examples of innocent archaisms we might quote "bewray," "despite," "list," "strait," "travail," "twain," and hundreds of others. Whether it would be necessary to wring the heart of the archæologist by removing "all to brake" and "earing," we need not stop to consider, as they do not occur in the New Testament.

If, on the other hand, I were asked to point out a *guilty* archaism, I should lay my finger at once on the translation of *μεριμνᾶν* in Matt. vi., 25, 31, 34, *μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε*, "*Take no thought* for your life, what ye shall eat;" *μὴ μεριμνήσητε λέγοντες τί φάγωμεν*, "*Take no thought*, saying What shall we eat?" *μὴ μεριμνήσητε εἰς τὴν αὔριον*, "*Take no thought*

for the morrow." I have heard of a political economist alleging this passage as an objection to the moral teaching of the Sermon on the Mount on the ground that it encouraged, nay, commanded a reckless neglect of the future. I have known of cases in which scrupulous consciences have been troubled by language seeming to condemn their most reasonable acts of care and forethought; of others in which religious persons have been misled by this paramount authority (as it seemed to be) into a systematic improvidence. A knowledge of the Greek would have shown that it is not reasonable forethought, but distress and anxiety about the future, which our Lord forbids; for this, and not less than this, is the force of *μέριμνα*, as may be seen from such passages as 1 Pet. v., 7, *πᾶσαν τὴν μέριμναν ὑμῶν ἐπιρίψαντες ἐπ' αὐτόν, ὅτι αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν*, where the distinction of *μέριμνα* and *μέλειν* is significant, though effaced in our English Version, "Casting all your *care* upon him, for he *careth* for you." A study of English archaisms, again, would have taught that our translators did not intend what they seem to say, for to "take thought" in the old language meant to distress or trouble one's self.* But the great mass of people have neither the time nor the opportunity, even if they had the capacity, for such investigations. This archaism, therefore, is one which, at all hazards, should disappear in any revision of the English Bible. For "take no thought" some have suggested "be not careful." But this, though an improvement, is very far from adequate. For *carefulness*, though in the 16th and 17th centuries it might be a term of reproof,† in the modern

* *e. g.*, 1 Sam. ix., 5, "Come, and let us return, lest my father . . . . *take thought* for us," where the Hebrew verb is דאג, which Gesenius renders *sollicitus fuit, anxie timuit.* "To die of thought" in the old language was to die heart-broken. On this archaism, see Trench, *Authorized Version*, p. 37; Wright, *Bible Word-Book*, s. v.

† In fact, it is used more than once to translate this very word *μέριμνα*; *e. g.*, 1 Cor. vii., 32, "I would have you without *carefulness*," *i. e.*, anxiety (*θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀμερίμνους εἶναι*); Phil. iv., 6, "Be *careful* for nothing" (*μηδὲν μεριμνᾶτε*).

Latimer, *Serm.*, p. 400 (quoted in Wright's *Bible Word-Book*, s. v.), speaks

language almost always implies commendation. In fact, it is an archaism open to the same misapprehension, though not to the same degree, as "take no thought." "Be not anxious" or "be not troubled" would adequately express the original. The word "anxious," it is true, does not occur in our English Bible, but this is one of those rare instances where our new revisers might well assume the liberty, which the authors of the Received Version certainly claimed and exercised before them, of introducing a new word where the language has shifted and no old word conveys the exact meaning.

But, though "take no thought" is the worst offender of all, yet other archaisms might with advantage be removed. We may suspect that many an Englishman, when he hears of Zacharias "asking for a *writing table* (Luke i., 63)," conceives a notion very different from the evangelist's own meaning. We have heard how the inquiring school-boy has been perplexed at reading that St. Paul and his companions "*fetched a compass*" when they set sail from Syracuse (Acts xxviii., 13), not being able to reconcile this statement with the date given for the invention of this instrument. We can well imagine that not a few members of an average congregation, when the incident in the synagogue at Nazareth is read, and they hear that the book, when closed, is handed "to the *minister*" (Luke iv., 20), do not carry away quite the correct idea of the person intended by this expression. We must have misgivings whether our Lord's injunction to the disciples to "take no *scrip*" with them, or St. Luke's statement that the apostle's company "took up their *carriages* and went up to Jerusalem" (Acts xxi., 15), are universally understood. We may feel quite certain that the great majority of readers do not realize the fact (for how should they?) that by the highest and the lowest *rooms* in the parable are meant merely the *places* or *seats** at the top or bottom of the same table,

of "this wicked carefulness," an expression which in the modern language would be a contradiction in terms.

* Again, in 1 Cor. xiv., 16, "He that *occupieth* the *room* of the unlearned,"

and that therefore the invitation to "go up higher" does not imply mounting a staircase to a more dignified reception-room in the upper story. We find that even a scholarly divine* seems to infer from St. Paul's language that (1 Tim. v., 4) the duty incumbent not only on children, but even on *nephews*, of providing for their aged relations; and finding this, we can hardly expect illiterate persons to know that in the old language *nephew* signifies *grandchild.*

Among these misleading archaisms the word *coast* for "border" or "region" is perhaps the most frequent. It would be unreasonable to expect the English reader to understand that when St. Paul "passes through the *upper coasts*" (τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη) on his way to Ephesus (Acts xix., 1), he does in fact traverse the high land which lies in the *interior* of Asia Minor. Again, in the Gospels, when he reads of our Lord visiting "the *coasts* of Tyre and Sidon" (Matt. xv., 21; Mark vii., 31), he naturally thinks of the sea-board, knowing these to be maritime cities, whereas the word in one passage stands for μέρη, "parts," and in the other for ὅρια, "borders," and the circumstances suggest rather the eastern than the western frontier of the region. And perhaps also his notions of the geography of Palestine may be utterly confused by reading that Capernaum is situated "upon the sea-coast" (Matt. iv., 13).

Then, again, how is such a person to know that when St. Paul condemns "debate" together with envy, wrath, murder, and the like (Rom. i., 29; 2 Cor. xii., 20), he denounces not discussion, but contention, strife (ἔρις); or that when he says, "If any man have a quarrel against any" (Col. iii., 13) he means a complaint (querela), the original being ἔχῃ μομφήν; or that, when St. James writes "*Grudge* not one against another" (v., 9), the word signifies "murmur" or "bemoan" (στενάζετε)?

a double archaism obscures the sense of the original ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον, "He that *filleth* the *place.*"

* Blunt, *Church of the First Three Centuries*, p. 27, "She was to have none of those children able to minister to her, nor yet nephews." See Trench's *Authorized Version*, p. 41.

Even if he is aware that "wicked *lewdness*" (Acts xviii., 14) does not signify gross sensuality, will he also know conversely that by "the hidden things of *dishonesty*" (2 Cor. iv., 2) the apostle means not fraudulence, want of probity, but "secret deeds of *shame*" (αἰσχύνης)? If context and common sense alike teach him that the "highmindedness" which St. Paul more than once condemns (ὑψηλοφρονεῖν, Rom. xi., 20; 1 Tim. vi., 17; τετυφωμένοι, 2 Tim. iii., 4) is not what we commonly understand by the term, will he also perceive that the "maliciousness" which is denounced alike by St. Paul (Rom. i., 29, "full of maliciousness") and St. Peter (1 Pet. ii., 16, "not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness") does not denote one special form of evil, but the vicious character generally (κακία)?

Again, the expressions *instantly* and *by-and-by* may be taken in connection, as being nearly allied; yet in Biblical language neither signifies what it would signify to ourselves. *Instantly* has not a temporal sense at all, but means "urgently," as in Luke vii., 4, "They besought him *instantly* (σπουδαίως);" while, on the other hand, *by-and-by*, having a temporal sense, denotes not deferred, but immediate action, standing most frequently for εὐθύς or εὐθέως, and therefore corresponding to the modern sense of *instantly*. Thus, in the Greek of the parable of the sower, the *instantaneous* welcome of the word has its counterpart in the *instantaneous* apostasy under persecution (Matt. xiii., 20, 21), εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνων αὐτόν, εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζεται; but in the English Version this appears, "*Anon* with joy receiveth it," "*By-and-by* he is offended," where, partly through the archaisms and partly through the change of words, the expressiveness of the original is seriously blunted.

The passage last quoted contains another archaism, which is a type of a whole class. Words derived from the Latin and other foreign languages, being comparatively recent, had very frequently not arrived at their ultimate sense when our version was made, and were more liable to shift their mean-

ing than others. We have witnessed this phenomenon in *instantly*, and the same was also the case with *offend*, *offence*. "If thy right eye *offend* thee," "Woe unto him through whom the *offences* come," do not convey to any but the educated reader the idea which they were intended to express. By substituting "cause to offend" (or perhaps "cause to stumble" or "to fall") for "offend," we may, in passages where the verb occurs, bring out the idea more clearly; but in the case of the substantive, the right of prescription and the difficulty of finding an equivalent may plead for the retention of the word. But where other Latinisms are concerned no such excuse can be pleaded. Thus, "Occupy till I come" (πραγματεύσασθε, Luke xix., 13), is quite indefensible. Wicliffe has *marchaundise;* Purvey *chaffer;* Tyndale *buy and sell;* and it is difficult to see why a word should have been substituted in the later Bibles, which must (one would think) have appeared novel and affected at the time, and which has changed its meaning since. I have suggested "*Trade* ye" above (p. 52). Another example is "O *generation* (γεννήματα) of vipers," which the English reader inevitably takes to be a parallel expression to "a wicked and adulterous *generation* (γενεά)," though the Greek words are quite different, and generation in the first passage signifies "offspring" or "brood"—two good old English words, either of which might advantageously be substituted for it. Another is the rendering of Acts xvii., 23, "As I passed by and beheld your devotions" (σεβάσματα), where "your devotions" is not a misrendering, but an archaism, signifying "the objects of your worship," "your gods or idols." Other instances, again, are 1 Tim. iii., 13, "They that have used the office of a deacon well, *purchase* (περιποιοῦνται) to themselves a good degree," where the idea of traffic suggested by the modern use of the word is alien to the passage; and Matt. xvii., 25, "When he was gone into the house, Jesus *prevented* (προέφθασεν) him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon?" in which passage, at all events, the original meaning of "prevent" would not suggest itself to the

English reader. In both cases we might with advantage recur to the renderings of Tyndale, "get" for "purchase," and "spake first" for "prevented."

From the word last mentioned we pass not unnaturally to the verb which it has supplanted. To *prevent* has taken the place of to *let*, meaning to check, to hinder, while this latter verb has become obsolete in this sense. Unnecessary and unadvisable as it would be to alter this archaism in such phrases as "Sore let and hindered in running the race that is set before us," where it can not mislead, its occurrence in the New Testament is not always free from objection. In 2 Thess. ii., 7, for instance—a passage difficult enough without any artificial obscurities—"He who now *letteth*, will *let*," should not be allowed to stand.

Not very dissimilar to the last instance is the ambiguity of "go about," used in our version as a common rendering of ζητεῖν. In such passages as John vii., 19, 20, "Why *go* ye *about to* kill me?" "Who *goeth about to* kill thee?" Acts xxi., 31, "As they *went about to* kill him," it can hardly occur to the English reader that nothing more is meant than "seek to kill," as the same phrase ζητεῖν ἀποκτεῖναι is translated elsewhere, and even in the very context of the first passage (John vii., 25). In Acts xxiv., 5, 6, again, the misunderstanding is rendered almost inevitable by the context, "A mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world . . . who also *hath gone about to* profane the Temple;" where the expression represents another verb similar to ζητεῖν in meaning, τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπείρασεν βεβηλῶσαι.

After disposing of the archaisms, little remains to be said about the English of our version. There are, however, some ambiguities of translation which arise from other causes. Thus Ephes. vi., 12, "Against spiritual *wickedness in high places*" (πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις), where the English reader is led to think of vice in persons of rank and station; Phil. iii., 14, "The prize of your *high* calling (τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως)," where the English epithet rather

suggests quality than locality, as the original requires; Col. iii., 8, "But now *you* also *put off* all these" (*νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα*), where the sentence appears to be indicative instead of imperative; 1 Tim. iii., 16, "And *without controversy* (*ὁμολογουμένως*) great is the mystery of godliness," where the meaning of "controversy" is ambiguous, and where the older versions translated *ὁμολογουμένως* "without nay" or "without doubt;" Heb. v., 2, "On the ignorant and on them that are *out of the way*" (*τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις*), where the repetition of the preposition leads the English reader still farther away from the proper sense of *πλανωμένοις*; Heb. v., 12, "For when *for the time* ye ought to be teachers" (*καὶ γὰρ ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τὸν χρόνον*), where without the Greek no one would imagine that "for the time" means "by reason of the long period of your training;" Apoc. iv., 11, "For thy pleasure they *are, and were created* (*εἰσὶ καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν*),"* where *are* reads as an auxiliary. In all such cases (and many other examples might be given) the remedy is easy.

The great merit of our version is its truly English character—the strength and the homeliness of its language. Its authors were fully alive to the importance of preserving this feature, as impressed upon the English Bible by Tyndale, and set their faces resolutely against the Latinisms to which the Rheims Version had attempted to give currency.† In this they were eminently successful as a rule, and it is only to be regretted that they allowed themselves occasionally to depart from their principle where there was no adequate need. The word *occupy*, which I have already considered from a different point of view, is an illustration. Another is *addict* in 1 Cor. xvi., 15, "They have addicted themselves (*ἔταξαν*

* So the received text; but the correct reading is *ἦσαν* for *εἰσί*.

† In this version I open a chapter accidentally (Ephes. iv.), and find "donation of Christ," "inferior parts," "doctors," "circumvention of errour," "juncture of submiuistration," "vanity of their sense," "impudicity," "contristate." Yet it was published nearly thirty years before the Authorized Version.

ἑαυτούς) to the ministry of the saints," which rendering seems to have been introduced first in the Bishops' Bible, and can not be considered an improvement on the Geneva Version, "They have given themselves to minister unto the saints." A more flagrant instance is 2 Cor. ix., 13, where a concurrence of Latinisms obscures the sense and mars the English, "By the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the Gospel of Christ," where "experiment" and "professed" ought at all events to be altered, as they have shifted their meaning, and where for once the Rheims Version gives purer English, "By the proof of this ministry glorifying God in the obedience of your confession unto the Gospel of Christ" (διὰ τῆς δοκιμῆς τῆς διακονίας ταύτης δοξάζοντες τὸν Θεὸν ἐπὶ τῇ ὑποταγῇ τῆς ὁμολογίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ).

A fault of another kind is translating ὄφελον "I would to God" (1 Cor. iv., 8), though the earlier versions all give it so with the exception of Wicliffe, whose simpler rendering "I would" might be adopted with advantage. In this case the introduction of the divine name is hardly defensible. In the case of μὴ γένοιτο, "God forbid," the difficulty of finding another idiomatic rendering may possibly excuse it. Yet even here we can not but regret a rendering which interferes so seriously with the argument, as it presents itself to the English reader, in such passages as Rom. iii., 4, 6, "God forbid; yea, let God be true (μὴ γένοιτο, γινέσθω δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθής)," "God forbid, for then how shall God judge the world (μὴ γένοιτο, ἐπεὶ πῶς κρινεῖ ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον)?"

I shall pass over instances of careless grammar in the English, because these are not numerous, and have been dealt with elsewhere. But it may be worth while to point out inadvertences of another kind—where the same word is twice rendered in the English Version, or where conversely the same English word is made to do duty for two Greek words. Of the latter, examples occur in John xi., 14, "*Then* (τότε οὖν) said Jesus unto them plainly," where "then" stands for two

words, "then" local and "then" argumentative; or Rom. vi., 21, "What fruit had ye *then* (*τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἴχετε τότε*) in those things whereof ye are now ashamed?" where exactly the same error is committed. Of the converse error — the double rendering of the same word—we have an instance in James v., 16, *πολὺ ἰσχύει δέησις δικαίου ἐνεργουμένη*, "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much," where the word "effectual" is worse than superfluous. This last rendering I am disposed to ascribe to carelessness in correcting the copy for the press. The word would be written down on the copy of the Bishops' Bible which the revisers used either as a tentative correction or an accidental gloss, and, not having been erased before the copy was sent to the press, would appear in the text.*

To the same cause, also, we may perhaps ascribe the rendering of 1 Cor. xiv., 23, *ἐὰν οὖν συνέλθῃ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὅλη ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό*. In the Bishops' Bible this stands, "If therefore all the Church be come together into *one* place," but in the Authorized, "If therefore the whole Church be come together into *some* place." I presume that the revisers intended to alter "one" into "the same," but that this correction was indistinctly made, and being confused with the other correction in the same clause which required a transposition of "the," led to the error which stands in our text. What misconception may arise from a mere error of the press appears from the often discussed phrase, "Strain *at* a gnat," where unquestionably our translators intended to retain the rendering of the earlier versions, "Strain *out* a gnat," and the existing text can only be explained as a misprint. Indeed, the printing of the edition of 1611 is very far from correct; and if our present

* In the Bishops' Bible, which the translators had before them, the passage runs, "The fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." The only fact connected with previous versions which I can discover as throwing any light on the insertion of this word "effectual" is a marginal note in Tomson's New Testament, printed with the Geneva Bible: "He commendeth prayers by the effects that come of them, that all men may understand that there is nothing more effectual than they are, so that they proceed from a pure mind."

Bibles for the most part deserve praise for great accuracy, we owe this to the fact that the text of this first edition was not regarded as sacred or authoritative, but corrections were freely introduced afterwards wherever a plain error was detected. Thus, in Exod. xxxviii., 11, "*Hoopes* of the pillars" has been altered into "*hooks* of the pillars;" in Isaiah xlix., 20, "The place is too *straight*" into "The place is too *strait;*" in Hos. vi., 5, "*Shewed* them by the prophets" (where the word "shewed" was evidently introduced by an ingenious compositor who did not understand the correct text) into "*Hewed* them by the prophets;" in Ecclus. xliv., 5, "*Rejected* verses" into "*recited* verses;" and the like. In the headings of the chapters, too, some curious errors in the edition of 1611 were afterwards corrected: e. g., 2 Sam. xxiv., "*eleven* thousand" into "*thirteen hundred* thousand;" 1 Cor. v., "shamed" into "shunned."* Nay, in some passages the changes made in later editions are even bolder than this, as, for instance, in 1 Tim. i., 4, *οἰκοδομιαν* [the correct reading is *οἰκονομίαν*] *Θεοῦ την ἐν πίστει*, "Edifying which is in faith," the word *Θεοῦ* by some inadvertence was untranslated in the edition of 1611, and so it remained for many years afterwards, until in the Cambridge edition of 1638 "godly" was inserted after the earlier versions, and this has held its ground ever since.† As this wise liberty was so freely exercised in other cases, it is strange that the obvious misprint "strain *at*" should have survived the successive revisions of two centuries and a half.

* The corrections in Ecclus. xliv., 5, 2 Sam. xxiv., were made in 1612; those in Exod. xxxviii., 11, Isa. xlix., 20, Hos. vi., 5, 1 Cor. v., in 1613. A number of errors, however, still remained, which were removed from time to time in later editions. The edition of 1613, though it corrected some blunders, was grossly inaccurate, as may be seen from the collation with the edition of 1611 prefixed to the Oxford reprint of the latter (1833).

† I owe this fact, which has probably been noticed elsewhere, to some valuable MS. notes of the late Prof. Grote on the printing of the English Bible. The error may be explained by supposing that the word "godly" was struck out in the copy of the Bishops' Bible altered for the press, while the proposed substitution was omitted to be made, or was made in such a way that it escaped the eye of the compositor.

While speaking of errors and corrections of the press, it may be worth while, in passing, to observe how this license of change has affected the orthography. It would be a surprise to an English reader now to find in his Bible such words as aliant, causey, charet, cise, crudle, damosell, fauchion, fet, fift, flixe, iland, mids, moe, monethes, neesing, oweth (Lev. xiv., 35, for "owneth"), price (Phil. iii., 14, for "prize"), renowme, etc. While these have been altered into alien, causeway, chariot, size, curdle, damsel, falchion, fetched, fifth, flux, island, midst, more, months, sneezing, owneth, prize, renown, respectively, a capricious conservatism has retained the archaic spelling in other cases, such as fat, fetches, graff, hoise, pilled, strawed, throughly, for vat, vetches, graft, hoist, peeled, strewed, thoroughly. In some cases this caprice appears in the same word; thus *neesings* is retained in Job xli., 18, while *sneezed* is substituted for *neesed* in 2 Kings iv., 35. This license has had its disadvantages as well as its advantages; if the substitution of "its" for "it" (Lev. xxv., 5, "it owne accord," 1611*) was imperatively demanded by the change in the language, the alteration of "shamefast, shamefastness" into "shamefaced, shamefacedness" is unfortunate, as suggesting a wrong derivation and an inadequate meaning. Amid all these changes it is a happy accident that the genuine form of the name of Philemon's wife has survived, though the precedent of the older versions and the authority of modern commentators alike would have led to the substitution of the Latin name "Appia" for the Phrygian "Apphia."†

* See Wright's *Bible Word-Book*, s.v. *It.*

† In Philem. 2 the reading is unquestionably Ἀπφίᾳ, though some uncial MSS. (of little value on a point of orthography) have ἀφφίᾳ, a legitimate form, or ἀμφίᾳ, a manifest corruption: the authority for Ἀππίᾳ is absolutely worthless. The fact is, that this word has no connection (except in sound) with the Roman Appia, but represents a native Phrygian name, which, with various modifications, appears again and again in the Phrygian inscriptions: *e. g.*, Boeckh, *Corp. Inscr.*, 3814, Νείκανδρος καὶ Ἀφφία γυνὴ αὐτοῦ; 3826, Πρωτόμαχος Ἀφ[φ]ίᾳ γυναικί; 3932 m, τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ Α[π]φίᾳ; 3962, Ἀπφία ἐγὼ κεῖμαι; 3827 l (Appx.), Ἀφφία Μενάνδρου; 3846 z (Appx.), Βωλᾶς Ἀφφίᾳ συνβίῳ. Frequently, also, we meet with the diminutive ἄπφιον, ἄφφιον, or

## V.

I have attempted to show in what directions our English Version is capable of improvement. It will be necessary to substitute an amended for a faulty text; to remove artificial distinctions which do not exist in the Greek; to restore real distinctions which, existing there, were overlooked by our translators; to correct errors of grammar and errors of lexicography; to revise the treatment of proper names and technical terms; and to remove a few archaisms, ambiguities, and faults of expression, besides inaccuracies of editorship, in the English. All this may be done without altering the character of the version.

In this review of the question I have done nothing more than give examples of the different classes of errors. An exhaustive treatment of the subject was impossible; and the case, therefore, is much stronger than it is here made to appear. If, for instance, any one will take the trouble to go through some one book of the New Testament, as the Epistle to the Hebrews, referring to any recent critical edition of the Greek text and comparing it carefully with the English, he will see that the faults of our version are very far from being few and slight, or imaginary. But, if a fair case for revision has been made out, it still remains to ask whether there is any reasonable prospect of success if the attempt be made at the present time.

Now in one important point—perhaps the most important of all—the answer must, I think, be favorable. Greek schol-

ἄφιον, as a female name: *e. g.*, 3849, 3891, 3899, 3902 m, 3846 z (Appx.). The form Ἄππη, however, sometimes occurs. This word may be compared with other common Phrygian names, Ammia, Nania, Tatia, and the masculine Pappias or Papias.

Not observing the Phrygian origin of the name, the commentators speak as though it were the feminine corresponding to the masculine in Acts xxviii., 15, Ἀππίου φόρον, and call attention to the difference in form, πφ for ππ. All the older translations, so far as I have observed, print it *Appia*, so that the Authorized Version stands alone in its correctness.

rashiip has never stood higher in England than it does at the present moment. There is not only a sufficient body of scholars capable of undertaking the work, but there is also (and this is a most important element in the consideration) a very large number besides fully competent to submit the work of the revisers, when completed, to a minute and searching criticism. And, though we may trust that any one who is called to take his share in the work will do so with a deep sense of the responsibility of the task assigned to him, still it will be a great stimulus to feel that he is surrounded by competent critics on all sides, and a great support to be able to gather opinions freely from without. But I would venture to go a step beyond this. I should be glad to think my apprehensions groundless, but there is at least some reason to forebode that Greek scholarship has reached its height in England, and that henceforth it may be expected to decline.* The clamors of other branches of learning—more especially of scientific studies—for a recognized place in general education are growing louder and louder, and must make themselves heard; and, if so, the almost exclusive dominion of the Classical languages is past. I need not here enter into the question whether these languages have or have not been overrated as an instrument of education. It is sufficient to call attention to the fact that, whether rightly or wrongly, public opinion is changing in this respect, and to prepare for the consequences.

And, if we turn from the Greek language to the English, the present moment seems not unfavorable for the undertaking. Many grave apprehensions have been expressed on this point, and alarming pictures are drawn of the fatal results

* Mr. Marsh (*Lectures on the English Language*, xxviii., p. 639) says, "There is no sufficient reason to doubt that at the end of this century the knowledge of Biblical Greek and Hebrew will be as much in advance of the present standard as that standard is before the sacred philology of the beginning of this century." I wish I could take this very sanguine view of the probable future of the Greek language in England: as regards Hebrew I have abstained from expressing an opinion.

which will follow from any attempt to meddle with the pure idiom of our English Bible. Of the infusion of Latinisms and Gallicisms with which we are threatened I myself have no fear. In the last century, or in the beginning of the present, the danger would have been real. The objections urged against the language of our English Bible by those who then advocated revision are now almost incredible. The specimens which they offered of an improved diction of the modern type would appear simply ludicrous to us if the subject on which the experiment was tried had been less grave.* The very words which these critics would have ejected from our English Bibles as barbarous, or uncouth, or obsolete, have again taken their place in our highest poetry, and even in our popular language. And though it is impossible that the nineteenth century should ever speak the language of the sixteenth or seventeenth, still a genuine appreciation and careful study of the Authorized Version and of the older translations will (we may reasonably hope) enable the present revisers, in the corrections which they may introduce, to avoid any anachronisms of diction which would offend the taste or jar upon the ear. There is all this difference between the present advocates of revision and the former, that now we reverence the language and idiom of our English Bibles, whereas they regarded it as the crowning offense which seemed most to call for amendment. In several instances the end may be attained by returning to the renderings of the earlier versions which the revisers of 1611 abandoned.

* See examples in Trench's *Authorized Version*, p. 32 seq., and Prof. Plumptre's article in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, s. v. *Version, Authorized*. "I remember the relief," writes Mr. Matthew Arnold (*Culture and Anarchy*, p. 44), "with which, after long feeling the sway of Franklin's imperturbable good sense, I came upon a project of his for a new version of the Book of Job to replace the old version, the style of which, says Franklin, has become obsolete, and thence less agreeable. 'I give,' he continues, 'a few verses which may serve as a sample of the kind of version I would recommend' . . . . I well remember how, when first I read that, I drew a deep breath of relief, and said to myself, After all, there is a stretch of humanity beyond Franklin's victorious good sense."

In almost every other case, the words and even the expressions which the correction requires will be supplied from some other part of the Authorized Version itself. Very rare indeed are the exceptions where this assistance will fail, and where it may be necessary to introduce a word for which there is no authority in the English Bibles. In these cases care must be taken that the word so introduced shall be in harmony with the general character of our Biblical diction. So much license the new revisers may reasonably claim for themselves, as it was certainly claimed by the revisers of 1611. If these cautions are observed, the Bible will still remain to future generations what it has been to past—not only the storehouse of the highest truth, but also the purest well of their native English. Indeed, we may take courage from the fact that the language of our English Bible is not the language of the age in which the translators lived, but in its grand simplicity stands out in contrast to the ornate and often affected diction of the literature of that time;* for if the retention of an older and better model was possible in the seventeenth century, it is quite as possible in the nineteenth.

Nor, again, can there be any reasonable ground for apprehension as to the extent and character of the changes which may be introduced. The regulations under which the new company of revisers will act are a sufficient guarantee against hasty and capricious change. The language which public speakers and newspaper critics have held on this point would only then have force if absolute power were given to each individual reviser to introduce all his favorite crotchets. But any one who has acted in concert with a large number of independent men, training apart and under separate influences, will know how very difficult it is to secure the consent of two thirds of the whole body to any change which is not a manifest improvement, and how wholly impossible it would be to obtain the suffrages of this number for a novel and questionable rendering, however important it might seem to its pro-

* See Marsh's *Lectures*, p. 621 seq.

poser. It is very possible that several corrections which I have suggested here may appear to others in this unfavorable light. Indeed, it is hardly probable that in all cases they should escape being condemned; for any one interested in such a subject is naturally led to give prominence to those views on which he lays stress himself, just because they appear to him not to have received proper attention from others; but if so, it is morally certain that they will be treated as they deserve, and not suffered to disfigure the Revised Version as it will appear before the public. Indeed, if there be any reasonable grounds for apprehension, the danger is rather that the changes introduced will be too slight to satisfy the legitimate demands of theology and scholarship, than that they will be so sweeping as to affect the character of our English Bible.

Lastly, in one respect, at least, the present revision is commenced under very auspicious circumstances. There has been great liberality in inviting the co-operation of those Biblical scholars who are not members of the Anglican communion, and they, on their part, have accorded a prompt and cheerful welcome to this invitation. This is a matter for great thankfulness. It may be accepted as a guarantee that the work is undertaken not with any narrow sectarian aim, but in the broad interests of truth; while also it is an earnest that if the revision, when completed, recommends itself by its intrinsic merits (and if it does not, the sooner it is forgotten the better), then no unworthy jealousy will stand in the way of its general reception.* And meanwhile may we not cherish a loftier hope? Now, for the first time, the bishops of

* "At this day," wrote Mr. Marsh in 1859, "there could be no harmony of action on this subject between different churches . . . So long as this sectarian feeling—for it can be appropriately designated by no other term—prevails on either side, there can be no union upon conditions compatible with the self-respect of the parties" (p. 641 seq.). This preliminary difficulty, at least, has been overcome; the "better counsels," of which this able writer seems to have despaired, have prevailed; no wound has been inflicted on self-respect; and entire harmony of action has been attained.

our Church and the representatives of our Convocation will meet at the same table with Nonconformist divines, and will engage in a common work of a most sacred kind—the interpretation of those writings which all alike reverence as the source of their truest inspiration here and the foundation of their highest hopes hereafter. Is it too much to anticipate that by the experience of this united work the Christian communities in England may be drawn more closely together, and that, whether it succeed or fail in its immediate object, it may at least dissipate many prejudices and jealousies, may promote a better mutual understanding, and thus, by fostering inward sympathy, may lead the way to greater outward harmony among themselves, and a more intimate union with the Divine Head?*

* It will be remembered that this hope was expressed before the Revision Company had met. If I felt at liberty to modify the expression by the light of subsequent experience, I should speak even more strongly.

# APPENDIX.

## *On the Words* ἐπιούσιος, περιούσιος.

### I.

The former of these two words, found only in a petition of the Lord's Prayer as given both by St. Matthew (vi., 11, *τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον*) and by St. Luke (xi., 3, *τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν*), is a well-known difficulty in Biblical interpretation, and it is certainly a remarkable fact that so much diversity of opinion should be possible regarding an expression which occurs in this most familiar and oftenest repeated passage of the Gospels.

Origen tells us (*De Orat.*, 27, i., p. 245, Delarue) that the word *ἐπιούσιον* does not once occur in Greek literature, and that it is not current in the colloquial language (*παρὰ οὐδενὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὔτε τῶν σοφῶν ὠνόμασται οὔτε ἐν τῇ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν συνηθείᾳ τέτριπται*). "It seems," he adds, to have been coined (*πεπλάσθαι*) by the evangelists. Matthew and Luke agree in using it without any difference. The same course has been taken in other cases also by persons translating from the Hebrew. For what Greek ever used either of the expressions *ἐνωτίζου* or *ἀκουτίσθητι*? . . . . . A similar expression to *ἐπιούσιον* occurs in Moses, being uttered by God, *But ye shall be to me a people περιούσιος*. And it seems to me that both words are formed from *οὐσία*."

This statement is important, because it shows that the Greek fathers derived no assistance in the interpretation of the word from the spoken or written language, and thus their views are not entitled to the deference which we should elsewhere accord to them as interpreters of a living language of which we only possess the fragmentary remains. In this particular instance they cease to be authorities. The same data which were open to them are open to us also, and from these we are free to draw our conclusions independently.

These data are threefold: (1.) The Etymological Form; (2.) The Requirements of the Sense; (3.) The Tenor of Tradition.

This last element seems to me to be especially important in the present case. The Lord's Prayer was doubtless used from very early times in private devotion. It certainly formed a part of the public services of the Church, in which (to mention no other use) it was repeated at the celebration of the Holy Eucharist.* The traditional sense, therefore, which was commonly attached to a word occurring in it must have a high value.

* Of the use of the Lord's Prayer in the early Church, see Bingham's *Antiquities*, xiii., vii., § 1 seq., and Probst, *Liturgie der drei ersten Christlichen Jahrhunderte*, Index, s. v. *Vater unser*.

It was chiefly the conviction that justice had not been done to this consideration which led me to institute the investigation afresh.* Previous writers have laid stress on the scholastic interpretation of Origen and his successors, as though this were the best authenticated tradition, when they ought rather to have sought for the common sense of the Church in the primitive versions, which are both earlier in date than Origen, and cover a much wider area. I hope to make the force of the distinction between the scholastic and traditional interpretations clearer in the sequel.

The different explanations which have been given to the word fall into two classes: (1.) Those which connect it with *ἰέναι*, deriving it from *ἐπιέναι* through *ἐπιὼν* or *ἐπιοῦσα*, and (2.) Those which connect it with *εἶναι*, as a compound from *ἐπὶ* and *οὐσία*. Each class includes various explanations, but the one is distinguished from the other by a simple criterion. The meanings belonging to the one class are *temporal*; to the other, *qualitative*.

In the *first* class we find the following: (i.) *to-morrow's*, derived directly from *ἐπιοῦσα*, "the coming day," or "the morrow:" (ii.) *coming*, either taken from *ἐπιοῦσα*, and meaning the same as the last, but more vaguely expressed, or derived directly from *ἐπιέναι*, *ἐπιών* (without the intervention of the feminine *ἐπιοῦσα*): (iii.) *daily*, which seems to be got from the first sense, "for the coming day:" (iv.) *continual*, which is probably a paraphrastic mode of expressing (i.) or (iii.): (v.) *future*, "yet to come," from *ἐπιών*; in which case the expression is most often applied in a spiritual sense to Christ, the bread of life, who shall come hereafter.

Under the *second* head, also, various explanations are comprised: (i.) *for our sustenance*, and so "necessary," *οὐσία* being referred to physical subsistence; (ii.) *for our essential life*, and so "spiritual, eternal," *οὐσία* signifying the absolute or higher being; (iii.) *pre-eminent*, *excellent*, *surpassing*, as being "above all *οὐσίαι*," and so nearly equivalent to *περιούσιος*; (iv.) *abundant*, a meaning akin to the last, and apparently reached by giving the same sense "above" to *ἐπί*; (v.) *consubstantial*, a sense which is attained by forcing the meaning of the preposition in another direction.†

In this list I have enumerated only those meanings which were given to the word during the first five centuries. More recent writers have added to the number, but their interpretations, when not deduced directly from one or other of the senses already given, are so far-fetched and so unnatural that they do not deserve to be seriously considered.

Again, I have confined myself to direct interpretations of *ἐπιούσιος*, not regarding such variations of meaning as arise from different senses attached to the substantive *ἄρτος*. Thus, for instance, "our *daily* bread" might be either the daily sustenance for the body or the daily sustenance for the soul. But, though these two senses are widely divergent, their divergence is not due to any difference of interpretation affecting *ἐπιούσιος*, with which word alone I am concerned.

* The fullest recent investigation of the meaning of *ἐπιούσιος* with which I am acquainted is in Tholuck's *Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount*, ii., p. 172 seq. (Engl. trans.), where he arrives at conclusions different from my own. He gives a list of previous treatises on the subject. Among the more important are those of Pfeiffer and Stolberg in the *Thesaur. Theol. Philol.*, ii., p. 116 seq., 123 seq. (Amstel., 1702).

† See the passage from Victorinus quoted on p. 174–5.

I shall now consider the two classes of meanings which are distinguished above, testing them by the considerations already enumerated: (1.) The Etymology of the Word; (2.) The Requirements of the Sense; (3.) The Tenor of Tradition.

### § 1. *The Etymology of the Word.*

Ἡ ἐπιοῦσα is commonly used for "the coming day," "the morrow." In this sense it occurs frequently without the substantive ἡμέρα both in Biblical Greek (Prov. xxvii., 1, *οὐ γὰρ γινώσκεις τί τέξεται ἡ ἐπιοῦσα*, Acts xvi., 11; xx., 15; xxi., 18) and elsewhere (e. g., Polyb., ii., 25, 11; Pausan., iv., 22, 3; Plut., *Mor.*, 205 E, 838 D, etc.). See also the references in Lobeck, *Phryn.*, p. 464. From this word, which had become practically a substantive, the adjective ἐπιούσιος would be formed in the usual way.

It is urged, indeed (see Suicer, *Thes.*, s. v. ἐπιούσιος), that the analogy of δευτεραῖος, τριταῖος, etc., would require ἐπιουσαῖος. In replying to this objection we need not (I venture to think) acquiesce in the negative answer that such adjectives are not valid to disprove the existence of a different form in -ιος. Whether we regard the etymolygy or the meaning, the analogy seems to be false. The termination -αῖος in all these adjectives is suggested by the long α or η of the feminines from which they are derived, δευτέρα, τρίτη, etc.,* and the short ending of ἐπιοῦσα is not a parallel case. Moreover, the meaning is not the same; for the adjectives in -αῖος fix a date, e. g., τεταρταῖος ἦλθεν, "he came *on the fourth day*," whereas the sense which we require here is much more general, implying simply *possession or connection*.

Or, again, the word might be derived from the masculine participle ἐπιών, as ἑκούσιος from ἑκών, ἐθελούσιος from ἐθέλων, γερούσιος from γέρων, πυγούσιος from πυγών, Ἀχερούσιος (or Ἀχερόντιος) from Ἀχέρων, etc.: see Lobeck, *Phryn.*, p. 4. To this derivation there is no grammatical objection. Only it may be pleaded that no motive existed for introducing an adjective by the side of ἐπιων sufficiently powerful to produce the result in an advanced stage of the language, when the fertility of creating new forms had been greatly impaired.

On the other hand, the derivation of ἐπιούσιος from ἐπί and οὐσία, if not impossible, is at least more difficult. Two objections have been taken to this etymology—the one, as it seems to me, futile; the other really formidable, if not insuperable. (1.) It is alleged that an adjective in -ούσιος would not be formed from the substantive οὐσία. To this it is sufficient to reply, that from this very word οὐσία we find the compounds ἀνούσιος (Clem. Alex., *Exc. Theod.*, p. 970, ed. Potter; Pseudo-Justin, *Conf. dogm. Arist.*, § 50, p. 145; ib., *Quast. Christ. ad Gent.*, p. 185 B), ἐνούσιος (Victorin., *c. Arium*, ii., 1; Synes., *Hymn.*, 2, p. 318: Cyril. Alex., *in Joann.*, v., 5, p. 527), ἐξούσιος (Philo, *in Flacc.*, § 10, ii., p. 528, Mang.), ἑτερούσιος (ἑτερουσίως, Porphyr. in Stob., *Ecl. Phys.*, 41, ii., p. 822), μονούσιος, ὁμοούσιος, ὑπερούσιος (Victorin., l. c.; Synes., l. c.), προανούσιος (Synes., *Hymn.*, l. c., and *Hymn.*, 3, p. 322), etc.; and from ἐξουσία the compounds αὐτεξούσιος (frequently, e. g., Diod., xiv.,

* It is not meant to assert that forms in αῖος can not be derived from other words than feminines in ᾱ or η, but, as a rule, they are derived in this way, though some exceptions occur: see Buttmann, *Ausf. Gramm.*, ii., p. 446.

105) and ὑπεξούσιος (see Steph., *Thes.*, s. v., ed. Dindorf and Hase). (2.) On the other hand, to the objection that the form should be ἐπούσιος, not ἐπιούσιος, I do not see what valid answer can be given. It has been thought sufficient to adduce in reply such words as ἐπιανδάνω, ἐπίουρα, ἐπιόσσομαι, which, however, are confined to poetry; and, again, ἐπιεικής, ἐπίορκος,* which occur also in prose. To this list other words might be added, such as ἐπίελπτος, ἐπιέννυμι, ἐπίηρα, ἐπιήρανος, ἐπιΐδμων, ἐπιΐστωρ. But the maintainers of this view have never inquired why the ι of ἐπί, which elsewhere is elided, has been exceptionally retained in such instances. The real fact is, that all these words, without exception, were originally written with the digamma, ἐπιϜανδάνω, ἐπίϜεικής, ἐπίϜελπτος, ἐπίϜορκος, etc., so that elision was out of the question; and even when the digamma disappeared in pronunciation or was replaced by a simple aspirate, the old forms maintained their ground.

In the present instance no such reason can be pleaded to justify the retention of the ι. The derivation of ἐπιούσιος from ἐπί, οὐσία, can only be maintained on the hypothesis that its form was determined by false analogies, with a view to exhibiting its component parts more clearly. But this hypothesis is not permissible if any other satisfactory explanation of the word can be given; for ἐπιούσιος would then be the single exception to the rule which determines compounds of ἐπί. In fact, the compound ἐπουσιώδης is found occasionally, thus showing that the final vowel of the preposition is naturally elided before οὐσία.

### § 2. *The Requirements of the Sense.*

It has been shown that etymological considerations favor the root ἰέναι as against εἶναι. It will be necessary, in the next place, to ask whether the exigencies of the sense require us to reverse the decision to which etymology has led us. Is there really any solid objection to our taking τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον to mean "our bread for the coming day?"

One objection, and one only, is urged repeatedly against this explanation. The petition so explained, it is thought, would be a direct violation of the precept which our Lord gives at the close of the chapter, vi., 34, μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε εἰς τὴν αὔριον.† To this I would reply, *first*, that though ἐπιοῦσα is most frequently a synonym for ἡ αὔριον, yet the words are not coextensive in meaning. If the prayer were said in the evening, no doubt ἡ ἐπιοῦσα would be "the following day, the morrow;" but supposing it to be used at or before dawn, the word would designate the day then breaking. Thus, in the Ecclesiazusæ of Aristophanes, one of the speakers, after describing the time (ver. 20), καίτοι πρὸς ὄρθρον γ' ἐστίν, "'tis close on daybreak," exclaims (ver. 105), νὴ τὴν ἐπιοῦσαν ἡμέραν, where τὴν αὔριον would be quite out of place. This instance shows the different power of the two words, which in some aspects may be said to contrast with each other; for the one implies

* ἐπιόγδοος is also adduced; but in the only passage quoted for this form, Plat., *Tim.*, 36 A, B, the best editions have the usual form ἐπόγδοος.

† It is astonishing to see with what persistence this worthless argument is repeated. I find it, for instance, in two of the most recent theological books which have come into my hands, written from directly opposite points of view: Delitzsch, *Brief an die Römer in das Hebräische übersetzt*, p. 27 (1870), and Keim, *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, ii., p. 279 (1871).

time *approaching*, and the other time *deferred*. But, *secondly* (and this seems to be a complete answer to the objection), this argument, if it proves any thing, proves too much. If the command *μὴ μεριμνᾶν* is tantamount to a prohibition against prayer for the object about which we are forbidden to be anxious, then not only must we not pray for to-morrow's food, but we must not pray for food at all. For he who says (ver. 34) *μὴ μεριμνήσητε εἰς τὴν αὔριον*, says also (ver. 25) *μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε*; and on this showing, whatever interpretation we put upon *ἐπιούσιον*, a precept will be violated. The fact is, that, as *μέριμνα* means *anxiety, undue thought* or *care* (see above, p. 145 seq.), prayer to God is not only consistent with the absence of *μέριμνα*, but is a means of driving it away. One apostle tells us (1 Pet. v., 7) to "cast all our anxiety (*μέριμνα*) on God, for he careth (*αὐτῷ μέλει*) for us." Another directs us "not to be anxious about any matter (*μηδὲν μεριμνᾶτε*), but in every thing, with prayer and supplication joined with thanksgiving, to make our desires known unto Gôd" (Phil. iv., 6). These injunctions we fulfill when we use the petition in the Lord's Prayer in a proper spirit. At the same time, even in our prayers we are directed specially to the needs of "the coming day," for in the very act of asking for distant material blessings there is danger of exciting in ourselves this *μέριμνα* which it is our duty to crush.*

On the other hand, if *ἐπιούσιον* be derived from *ἐπί, οὐσία*, we have the choice between the two senses of *οὐσία*, (1.) "subsistence," and (2.) "essence, being." Of these the latter must be rejected at once. It is highly improbable that a term of transcendental philosophy should have been chosen, and a strange compound invented for insertion in a prayer intended for every-day use. Indeed, nothing could well be conceived more alien to the simplicity of the Gospel-teaching than such an expression as *ἐπιούσιος*, meaning "suited to," or "conducive to the *οὐσία*, the essential being." If, therefore, this derivation from *οὐσία* is tenable at all, we must be prepared to assign to it the more homely meaning "subsistence," so that *ἐπιούσιος* will be "sufficient to sustain us," "enough for our absolute wants, but not enough for luxury." Such a sense in itself would meet the requirements of the passage. Only it does not seem likely that a strange word, which arrives at this meaning in an indirect way, should have been invented to express a very simple idea for which the Greek language had already more than one equivalent. Nor, indeed, is it a natural sense for the word to bear. In Porphyr., *Isag.*, 16, and elsewhere, *ἐπουσιώδης* is used to signify *accidental* as opposed to *essential*, denoting what is *superadded to the οὐσία*; and if such a compound as *ἐπιούσιος* (from *οὐσία*) were possible, it ought to have a similar meaning.

### § 3. *The Tenor of Tradition.*

Hitherto we have seen no sufficient reason for abandoning the derivation from *ἰέναι*, while, on the other hand, serious difficulties are encountered by

* The moral bearing of this petition is well put by St. Basil (*Reg. brev. tract.*, eclii., ii., p. 500), though he wrongly interprets the word itself: *ὁ ἐργαζόμενος μηδενείων τοῦ κυρίου λέγοντος Μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε ἢ τι πίητε . . . τὸν ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον, τουτέστι τὸν πρὸς τὴν ἐφημέρον ζωὴν τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἡμῶν χρησιμεύοντα, οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἐπιτρέπει ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ ἐντυγχάνει περὶ τούτου, κ.τ.λ.*

adopting the alternative, and deriving the word from *εἶναι*. It remains to inquire how far this result is borne out by tradition.

Tholuck, discussing the two derivations of *ἐπιούσιος*, from *εἶναι* and *ἴέναι* respectively, states, "The oldest and most widely spread is the former;" and Suicer, mentioning the derivation from *ἡ ἐπιούσα*, adds, "Nemo ex veteribus ita explicat." I hope to show that such statements are the very reverse of the truth; that, so far as our evidence goes, the derivation from *ἴέναι* is decidedly the more ancient; and that, though the other prevailed widely among Greek interpreters after Origen, yet it never covered so wide an area as its elder rival. I shall take the great divisions of the Church as distinguished by their several languages, and investigate the traditional sense assigned to the word in each.

1. In the *Greek* Church the first testimony is that of ORIGEN (*De Orat.*, 27, l. c.). He himself derives the word from *οὐσία*, adducing *περιούσιος* as an analogy. This analogy, as we have already seen, is false; for, whereas *ἐπὶ* loses the final vowel in composition, *περὶ* retains it; so that while the one compound would be *περιούσιος*, the other would be *ἐπούσιος*. Thus derived, the word signifies, according to Origen, *τὸν εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν ἡμῶν συμβαλλόμενον ἄρτον*. It is the spiritual bread which nourishes the spiritual being, *ὁ τῇ φύσει τῇ λογικῇ καταλληλότατος καὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ αὐτῇ συγγενής*, κ.τ.λ. This view Origen supports by quoting other passages where the heavenly bread is mentioned, and at the close of the discussion he adds (p. 249 c), "Some one will say that *ἐπιούσιον* is formed [l. *κατεσχηματίσθαι*] from *ἐπιέναι*; so that we are bidden to ask for the bread which belongs to the future life (*τὸν οἰκεῖον τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*), that God may anticipate and give it to us even now, so that what shall be given as it were to-morrow may be given to us to-day (*ὥστε τὸ οἱονεὶ αὔριον δοθησόμενον σήμερον ἡμῖν δοθῆναι*); the future life being represented by *to-morrow*, and the present by *to-day*; but the former acceptation is better in my judgment, etc." Thus the earliest notice among Greek-speaking Christians reveals a conflict between the two derivations. It is true that in either case Origen contemplates a spiritual rather than a literal interpretation of the bread, but this fact accords with the general principles of the Alexandrian school from which the notice emanates, for this school is given to importing a mystical sense into the simple language of the Gospel. This ulterior question does not affect the derivation of the word.

So far as I am acquainted with the language of Origen elsewhere, his mode of speaking here is quite consistent with the supposition that he himself first started the derivation from *εἶναι*, *οὐσία*. At all events, this supposition accords with his fondness for importing a reference to "absolute being" into the language of the apostles and evangelists elsewhere, as, for instance, when he interprets *τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν* (omitting the words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*) in Ephes. i., 1, and *ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ* in 1 Cor. i., 28, in this sense (see Cramer's *Catena* on Ephes., l. c.). A derivation which transferred the word *ἐπιούσιος* at once from the domain of the material to the domain of the suprasensual would have a strong attraction for Origen's mind. Still, it must remain a pure hypothesis that he himself invented this derivation. He may have got it from one of his predecessors, Pantænus or Clement; but, at all events, it bears the impress of the Alexandrian school. On the other hand, his own

language shows that the other etymology (from ἐπιέναι) had its supporters. How few or how numerous they were, the vagueness of his expression will not allow us to speculate. It is only when we come to the versions that we find solid ground for assuming that in the earliest age this was the prevailing view.

The next Greek writer whose opinion is known was also an Alexandrian. The great Athanasius (*De Incarn.*, § 16, i., p. 706) derives the word from ἐπιέναι, but gives it a theological meaning: "Elsewhere he calls the Holy Spirit heavenly bread, saying, *Give us this day* τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τ�ον ἐπιούσιον,* for he taught us in his prayer to ask in the present life for τὸν ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον, that is, *the future*, whereof we have the first-fruits in the present life, partaking of it through† the flesh of the Lord, as he himself said, *The bread which I shall give is my flesh*, etc." This is exactly the account of the word which Origen rejects.

To those, however, who have studied the early history of Biblical interpretation, it will be no surprise to find that Origen's explanation of this word exerted a very wide and lasting influence. It is a common phenomenon to find nearly all the Greek expositors following him, even in cases where his interpretation is almost demonstrably wrong. If his explanations had the good fortune to be adopted by the Antiochene school, as was frequently the case, they passed unchallenged, and established themselves in the Church at large. In this particular instance the procedure of the Antiochene school would appear to have been characteristic, both in its agreement with and in its departure from Origen. While accepting his derivation, they seem to have substituted a realistic for his mystical sense of ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος. The adjective, thus explained, becomes "for our material subsistence," and not "for our spiritual being."

The views of the earliest representatives of the Antiochene school on this point are not recorded. But they may perhaps be assumed not only from the general tenor of later interpretations in this school (from Chrysostom downward), but also from the opinions of the Cappadocian fathers.

In the treatise of Gregory Nyssen, *De Orat. Domin.*, iv., i., p. 745, this view is stated very explicitly: "We are ordered," he says, "to ask for what is sufficient for the preservation of our bodily subsistence (τὸ πρὸς τὴν συντήρησιν τῆς σωματικῆς οὐσίας)." The same interpretation is adopted by his brother Basil (*Reg. brev. tract.*, cclii., ii., p. 500), who explains τὸν ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον as that "which is serviceable for our daily life for our subsistence (τὸν πρὸς τὴν ἐφήμερον ζωὴν τῇ οὐσιᾳ ἡμῶν χρησιμεύοντα)." The same derivation, though not quite the same meaning, is assigned to it also by Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.*, xxiii. (*Mystag.*, v.), 15, p. 329: "This holy bread is ἐπιούσιος, being appointed for the subsistence (or substance) of the soul (ἐπὶ τὴν οὐσίαν τῆς ψυχῆς κατατασσόμενος). This bread does not go into the bel-

* The Benedictine editor translates ἐπιουσιον here by *supersubstantialem* after Jerome, though the context of St. Athanasius is directly against this. At the same time, Athanasius arrives at the same mystical meaning of τὸν ἄρτον τὸν ἐπιούσιον as Jerome, though through a different derivation.

† διὰ is absent from some texts, but seems to be correct. If it is omitted, the sense will be "partaking of the flesh."

ly, nor is it cast out into the draught, but is distributed into the whole of thy complex frame (*εἰς πᾶσάν σου τὴν σύστασιν ἀναδίδοται*) for the benefit of body and soul;" where an application chiefly, though not exclusively spiritual, is given to *οὐσία*. Again, St. Chrysostom, *De Ang. Port., etc.*, 5,* iii., p. 35, interprets *ἐπιούσιον* "which passes to the substance of the body (*ἐπὶ τὴν οὐσίαν τοῦ σώματος διαβαίνοντα*), and is able to compact (*συγκροτῆσαι*) this;" but elsewhere, in his Homily on St. John (xliii., § 2, viii., p. 257), he explains *τοῦ ἄρτου τοῦ ἐπιουσίου, τουτέστι, τοῦ καθημερινοῦ*; while on St. Matthew, where the passage itself occurs, he expresses himself in such a vague way as if he were purposely evading a difficulty (xix., § 5, vii., p. 251 seq.), *τί ἐστι τὸν ἄρτον τὸν ἐπιούσιον*; *τὸν ἐφήμερον . . . δεῖται [ἡ φύσις] τροφῆς τῆς ἀναγκαίας . . . ὑπὲρ ἄρτου μονον ἐκέλευσε τὴν εὐχὴν ποιεῖσθαι, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄρτου τοῦ ἐφημέρου, ὥστε μὴ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἄυριον μεριμνᾶν· διὰ τοῦτο προσέθηκε, τὸν ἄρτον τὸν ἐπιούσιον, τουτέστι, τὸν ἐφήμερον· καὶ οὐδὲ τούτῳ ἠρκέσθη τῷ ῥήματι ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτερον μετὰ τοῦτο προσεθήκεν, εἰπών, δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον· ὥστε μὴ περαιτέρω συντρίβειν ἑαυτοὺς τῇ φροντίδι τῆς ἐπιούσης ἡμέρας*, where he shelters himself under the vagueness of *ἐφήμερος* without explaining how he arrives at this meaning, and where the somewhat ambiguous words "not to afflict ourselves *further* with the thought of the coming (*ἐπιούσης*) day" seem to allow, if not to suggest, the derivation from *ἐπίοῦσα*. In a later passage of the same Homilies (lv., § 5, p. 562), and in his Exposition of Psalm cxxvii. (v., p. 364), he again quotes this petition, but avoids an explanation; in his Homilies on Genesis (liv., § 5, iv., p. 530 seq.) he adduces it as setting the proper limits to our desire for temporal goods, *τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον, ἀντὶ τοῦ, τὴν τῆς ἡμέρας τροφήν*; while on Philippians iv., 19 (*Hom.* xv., § 4, xi., p. 316), commenting on the words *πληρώσει πᾶσαν χρείαν ὑμῶν*, he adds "so as not to be in want, but to have what is needful (*τὰ πρὸς χρείαν*), for Christ also put this in his prayer when teaching us *τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον*." Thus he seems throughout to be wavering between the meanings *daily* and *necessary*, i. e., between the derivations from *ἰέναι* and *εἶναι*, though he tends towards the latter. Again, Theodoret, on Phil. iv., 19, following Chrysostom, quotes this petition as warranting St. Paul in asking for his converts *τὴν κατὰ τὸν παρόντα βίον χρείαν*.

Somewhat later, Cyril of Alexandria, on Luke xi., 3 (*Mai*, ii., p. 266), thus comments on *ἐπιούσιον*: "Some say that it is that which shall come and shall be given in the future life; . . . . but if this were true, . . . . why do they add, *Give us day by day?* For one may see likewise by these words that they make their petition for daily food; and we must understand by *ἐπιούσιον* what is sufficient (*τὸν αὐτάρκη*), etc."†

Later Greek writers contented themselves with repeating one or more of the interpretations given by their predecessors. Thus Damascene (*Orthod. Fid.*, iv., 13, i., p. 272, Lequien) says, *οὗτος ὁ ἄρτος ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἄρτου, ὅς ἐστιν ὁ ἐπιούσιος· τὸ γὰρ ἐπιούσιον δηλοῖ ἢ τὸν μέλλοντα, τουτέστι, τὸν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, ἢ τὸν πρὸς συντήρησιν τῆς οὐσίας ἡμῶν λαμβανόμενον*;

* It is right to mention that the authorship of this Homily has been questioned. See the Preface in Montfaucon's edition.

† In *Glaphyr. in Exod.*, ii., i., p. 286, ed. Auberti, he explains this petition as equivalent to asking for *τὰ εἰς ζωὴν ἐπιτήδεια*.

and THEOPHYLACT (on Luke xi., 3) explains it *τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἡμῶν καὶ τῇ συστάσει τῆς ζωῆς συμβαλλόμενον, οὐ τὸν περιττὸν πάντως ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀναγκαῖον* (see also on Matt. vi., 11).*

2. From the *Aramaic* Christians, the testimony in favor of the derivation from *ἐπιέναι* is stronger.

We learn from St. Jerome (*in Matth.* vi., 11, vii., p. 34) that in the GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS the word *ἐπιούσιον*, which he translated "supersubstantialem," was rendered by Mahar (מחר), "quod dicitur *crastinum*, ut sit sensus, *Panem nostrum crastinum*, id est *futurum*, *da nobis hodie*."

Whatever view be adopted of the origin of this apocryphal Gospel, its evidence has the highest value in this particular instance. Of its great antiquity no question can be entertained. It can hardly have been written much later than the close of the first century. It was regarded as an authoritative document by the Judaizing Christians of Palestine. It adhered very closely to the Gospel of St. Matthew, and was even thought by some to be the Hebrew (i. e., Aramaic) original of this Gospel, though the variations are too considerable to admit this simple solution. On the whole, we may conclude with high probability that its traditions were not derived through the Greek, but came from some Aramaic source or sources—whether from an oral Gospel, or from written notes put together for catechetical purposes, or from the Aramaic copy of St. Matthew's Gospel altered to suit the purposes of the writer. But, even if it were derived from our Greek Gospels, its interpretation of *ἐπιούσιον* would still have the greatest weight as proceeding from Palestine at this very early date. In a familiar expression in the most familiar of all the evangelical records, it is not unreasonable to assume that the tradition would be preserved at the close of the apostolic age unimpaired in the vernacular language of our Lord and his disciples.†

From the Gospel according to the Hebrews we turn to another Aramaic source, emanating from a different quarter, the CURETONIAN SYRIAC Version of the New Testament.

In Matt. vi., 11, this version has:

ܠܠܚܡܢ ܕܣܝܡ ܝܘܡܢ ܕܡܬܬܝܐ ܠܢ ܗܒ ܠܢ ܝܘܡܐ ܟܠ ܝܘܡ.

"And-our-bread continual of-the-day give-to-us."

In Luke xi., 3:

ܠܚܡܢ ܕܣܝܡ ܝܘܡܢ ܕܡܬܬܝܐ ܗܒ ܠܢ ܝܘܡܐ ܟܠ ܝܘܡ.

"And-give to-us the-bread continual of-every-day."

Here the temporal sense "continual," given to *ἐπιούσιον*, connects it with *ἐπιέναι*, whether through *ἐπιοῦσα*, "for the coming day," and so "daily, constant," or, more directly, "ever coming," and so "perpetual."‡

* A number of different interpretations are huddled together by an anonymous writer in Origen, *Op.* i., p. 910 (ed. Delarue).

† It is unnecessary here to discuss the question to what extent Greek was spoken in Palestine at the Christian era. Even if, with Dr. Roberts, in his instructive work, *Discussions on the Gospels*, we take the view that the Palestinian Jews were bi-lingual, the argument in the text will still hold good.

‡ Cureton compares Numbers, ch. iv., v. 7, לחם התמיד, translated in the Syriac

When, however, we turn from the Curetonian to the later revision, the PESHITO SYRIAC, we find that the influence of the Greek interpreters has been at work meanwhile. The word "necessary" is substituted for "constant," the *qualitative* sense for the *temporal*, i. e., the derivation from εἶναι for the derivation from ἰέναι.

In Matt. vi., 11 of this version, the petition runs,

ܠܚܡܐ ܕܣܘܢܩܢܢ ܕܫܪܝ ܠܝܘܡܢ ܗܒ ܠܢ

"Give to-us the-bread of-our-necessity this-day."

In Luke xi., 3:

ܠܚܡܐ ܕܣܘܢܩܢܢ ܕܫܪܝ ܠܝܘܡ ܝܘܡ ܗܒ ܠܢ

"Give to-us the-bread of-our-necessity every-day."

This is only one of the many instances where the Peshito betrays the influences of the fourth century whether in the text or in the interpretation.*

In the still later HARCLEAN VERSION (A.D. 616), again, this same interpretation is adopted in both passages, though slightly varied in form.

In Matt. vi., 11:

ܠܚܡܐ ܕܣܘܢܩܢܢ ܕܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܗܒ ܠܢ ܕܫܪܝ

"The-bread of-us that necessary give to-us this-day."

In Luke xi., 3:

ܠܚܡ ܕܣܘܢܩܢܢ ܕܫܪܝ ܗܒ ܠܢ ܕܝܘܡ

"The-bread of-necessity of-us give to-us this-day:"

with a v. l. ܠܚܡ ܕܐܬܐ ܐܝܟ (i. e., τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν) for ܕܝܘܡ (σήμερον).

Again, the JERUSALEM SYRIAC, which was perhaps translated from a Greek Lectionary, and can hardly be earlier than the 5th century, also appears to derive ἐπιούσιος from εἶναι, οὐσία, but gives it a different sense, apparently confusing it with περιούσιος, as St. Jerome does.

In Matt. vi., 11, it has,

ܠܚܡ ܕܝܬܪܘܢ ܗܒ ܠܢ ܕܫܪܝ

"Our-bread of-opulence (or "abundance") give to-us this-day" (i., p 234, ed. Miniscalchi-Erizzo). The corresponding passage in St. Luke is not extant in this version.

Thus among the Aramaic Christians, the earliest tradition, which has reached us by two distinct channels, connects the word with ἐπιέναι; while in the later versions, after the influence of the Greek interpreters had made itself felt, this traditional sense has been displaced by the derivation from οὐσία.

It will be seen hereafter how the later rendering substituted by St. Jerome failed to suppress the traditional *quotidianum* of the Old Latin. In the same

ܠܚܡ ܕܣܘܢܩܢܢ. His own speculations respecting the original reading in St. Matthew seem both unnecessary and untenable.

* Prof. Wright informs me that he has not found any variation in the earliest MSS. of the Peshito in the British Museum belonging to the 5th, 6th, and 7th centuries.

way the ܩܘܪܝܐ of the Old (Curetonian) Syriac, though it does not show equal vitality, occurs occasionally, and still survives long after the later revision of the New Testament, which we call the Peshito, had superseded the earlier version or versions. Thus, in the Syriac recension of the *Acts of Thomas*—which must be a very ancient work, for it has a distinctly Gnostic character—the Lord's Prayer is quoted towards the end, and the petition in question runs

ܗܒ ܠܢ ܠܝܘܡܢ ܩܘܪܝܐ ܕܝܘܡܢ ܕܡܝܘܡ

closely following this version.* Again, in one of the poems of Jacob of Sarug, who died A.D. 521 (Zingerle's *Monumenta Syriaca*, p. 31, Innsbrück, 1869), it is said of the patriarch Jacob (see Gen. xxviii., 20) that he "prayed the prayer which our Lord taught:

ܠܝ ܗܒ ܕܝܘܡܢ ܩܘܪܝܐ ܕܝܘܡ ܕܡܝ ܠ

The-bread continual of-the-day give to-me."

And lower down he again repeats the characteristic words:

ܕܝܘܡܢ ܩܘܪܝܐ ܕܝܘܡ.†

This rendering of τὸν ἄρτον τὸν ἐπιούσιον is found also in an *Exposition of the Lord's Prayer* by the same writer, preserved in the MS., Brit. Mus., *Add.*, 17, 157 (dated A.G. 876=A.D. 565), in which the expression is repeated not less than three times, fol. 48 *a*, 49 *a*.‡

3. The testimony of the *Egyptian* versions, again, is highly valuable, both as preserving a very ancient tradition (for it would seem that they must both be assigned to the close of the second or beginning of the third century), and as representing a distinct and isolated section of the Church.

The MEMPHITIC, the version of Lower Egypt, and the THEBAIC, the version of Upper Egypt, agree in the derivation from ἴέναι; and their agreement is the more valuable, inasmuch as their general character shows them to be independent the one of the other.

* These Acts are found in a British Museum MS., *Add.*, 14, 645, and have been recently edited by Prof. Wright, in his *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, 1871. The text of the Lord's Prayer in these Acts agrees generally with the Curetonian Version as against the Peshito.

† This passage was pointed out to me by Mr. Bensly, of the Cambridge University Library. I had also hoped that I might find this petition quoted in the works of one of the earlier Syriac writers, Aphraates or Ephrem, but my search has not been attended with success. An indirect reference in Ephrem (*Op.*, vi., p. 642) omits the word in question.

ܠܡܚܪ ܠܚܡ ܕܝܘܡܢ ܩܘܪܝܐ ܕܝܘܡ ܕܡܝ ܠ
ܕܝܠܗ.

"The bread of the day shall suffice thee, as thou hast learnt in the Prayer." At the same time, Ephrem agrees with the Curetonian against the Peshito in ܩܘܪܝܐ, so that it seems *probable* he used the Curetonian Version. Prof. Wright, at my request, examined several Syriac Service-books in the British Museum Library. He reports that all the volumes which he examined are Jacobite, and that "the reading invariably agrees with the Peshito text of Matt. vi., 11. They belong to the 9th, 10th, and 11th centuries." ‡ These references were communicated to me by Prof. Wright.

The Memphitic Version has:

In Matt. vi., 11:

ⲡⲉⲛϣⲓⲕ ⲛ̀ⲧⲉⲣⲁⲥⲧⲓ ⲙⲏⲓⲥ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲙ̀ⲫⲟⲟⲩ.

"Our bread of-to-morrow give-it to-us to-day."

In Luke xi., 3:

ⲡⲉⲛϣⲓⲕ ⲉⲑⲛⲏⲟⲩ ⲙⲏⲓⲥ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲙ̀ⲙⲏⲛⲓ.

"Our bread that-cometh give-it to-us daily."

The Thebaic Version:

In Matt. vi., 11:

ⲡⲉⲛⲟⲉⲓⲕ ⲉⲧⲛⲏⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲓ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲟⲩ.

"Our bread that-cometh give-thou it to us to-day."

The corresponding passage of St. Luke in this version is not preserved.

Here we have a choice of two translations, both founded on the same derivation, the one through *ἐπιοῦσα*, the other directly from *ἐπιέναι*.

In all the Coptic (i.e., Memphitic) Service-books which I have seen, the rendering of *ἐπιούσιον* is ⲛ̀ⲧⲉⲣⲁⲥⲧⲓ, "of to-morrow."

4. The *Latin* churches preserve a still more ancient tradition. The Old Latin Version, which dates certainly from the second century, and not improbably, so far as regards the Gospels, from the first half of the century, renders *ἐπιούσιον* by *quotidianum* in both evangelists. Of this rendering there can be no doubt. It is found in the extant manuscripts of the Old Latin Version in both places. It is quoted, moreover, by the early Latin fathers Tertullian (*De Orat.*, 6) and Cyprian (*De Orat.*, p. 104, Fell). Though both these fathers are commenting especially on the Lord's Prayer, and both adopt a spiritual sense of the petition, as referring to Christ the living bread and to the eucharistic feast, yet they comment on "quotidianum" from this point of view, and seem to be unaware that any other rendering is possible.

At length, in the fourth century, the influence of the scholastic interpretation, put forward by Origen and the Greek fathers, makes itself felt in Latin writers. The first semblance of any such influence is found in Juvencus, the Latin poet, who wrote a metrical history of the Gospel about A.D. 330–335. He renders the words

> "Vitalisque hodie sancti *substantia* panis
> Proveniat nobis."—*Evang. Hist.*, i., 631.

Here, however, though the coincidence is curious, no inference can safely be drawn from the occurrence of "substantia," since Juvencus elsewhere uses the word with a genitive as a convenient periphrasis to eke out his metre, without any special significance; e.g., i., 415, "substantia panis" (Matt. iv., 4); i., 510, "salis substantia" (Matt. v., 13); ii., 420, "vocis substantia" (Matt. ix., 32); ii., 524, "animæ substantia" (Matt. xi., 5); ii., 677, "credendi substantia" (John v., 38); iii., 668, "arboris substantia" (Matt. xxi., 21).

In Victorinus the Rhetorician, who was acquainted with the Greek commentators, the first distinct traces of this interpretation in the Latin Church are found. In his treatise *against Arius*, completed about the year 365, he writes (i., 31, *Bibl. Vet. Patr.*, viii., p. 163, ed. Galland.): "Unde deductum

ἐπιούσιον quam a substantia? *Da panem nobis ἐπιούσιον hodiernum.* Quoniam Jesus vita est, et corpus ipsius vita est, corpus autem panis. . . . . Significat ἐπιούσιον ex ipsa aut in ipsa substantia, hoc est, vitæ panem." And again (ii., 8, ib., p. 177): "ἐπιούσιον ἄρτον, ex eadem οὐσία panem, id est, de vita Dei, consubstantialem vitam. . . . Græcum igitur evangelium habet ἐπιούσιον, quod denominatum est a substantia, et utique Dei substantia: hoc Latini vel non intelligentes vel non valentes exprimere non potuerunt dicere, et tantummodo *quotidianum* posuerunt, non ἐπιούσιον." Setting himself to defend the ὁμοούσιον of the Nicene Creed against the charge of novelty, Victorinus seizes with avidity a derivation of ἐπιούσιον which furnishes him with a sort of precedent.

Again, in St. Ambrose we find distinct references to this derivation. In a treatise ascribed to this father (*De Sacram.*, v., 4, § 24, ii., p. 378) we read, "Quare ergo in oratione dominica, quæ postea sequitur, ait *Panem nostrum?* Panem quidem sed ἐπιούσιον, hoc est, *supersubstantialem.* Non iste panis est qui vadit in corpus; sed ille panis vitæ æternæ qui animæ nostræ substantiam fulcit. Ideo Græce ἐπιούσιος dicitur: Latinus autem hunc panem *quotidianum* dixit [quem Græci dicunt *advenientem*];* quia Græci dicunt τὴν ἐπιοῦσαν ἡμέραν advenientem diem. Ergo quod Latinus dixit et quod Græcus, utrumque utile videtur. Græcus utrumque uno sermone significavit, Latinus *quotidianum* dixit. Si quotidianus est panis cur post annum illum sumis, quemadmodum Græci in oriente facere consuerunt? Accipe quotidie, quod quotidie tibi prosit, etc." The writer seems here to combine the two derivations of ἐπιούσιον, as though the word could have a double etymology. At least I can not interpret "Græcus utrumque uno sermone significavit" in any other way.† The authorship of the treatise, however, is open to question, as it contains some suspicious statements and expressions. But, whoever may have been the writer, the work appears to be early. If he owed the expression *supersubstantialis* to St. Jerome's revision, as was probably the case, even this is consistent with the Ambrosian authorship, as several of his father's works were written after St. Jerome had completed the Gospels.

Again, in an unquestioned treatise of St. Ambrose (*De Fide*, iii., 15, § 127, ii., p. 519), written in the years 377, 378, this father, defending the word ὁμοούσιον against the Arians, uses the same argument as Victorinus: "An negare possunt οὐσίαν lectam, cum et panem ἐπιούσιον Dominus dixerit et Moyses scripserit ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος? Aut quid est οὐσία, vel unde dicta, nisi οὖσα ἀεί, quod semper maneat? Qui enim est, et est semper, Deus est; et ideo manens semper οὐσία dicitur divina substantia. Propterea ἐπιούσιος panis, quod ex verbi substantia substantiam virtutis manentis cordi et animæ subministret; scriptum est enim, *Et panis confirmat cor hominis* (Psa. ciii., 15)." The etymological views of a writer who derives οὐσια from οὖσα ἀεί can have no value in themselves. The notice is only important as showing that the derivation from οὐσία was gaining ground. At the same time, like the passage of Victorinus, it suggests a motive which would induce many to

* The words in brackets are omitted in many MSS., and seem to be out of place.

† Pfeiffer, in the *Thesaur. Theol. Philol.*, ii., p. 117 (Amstel., 1702), explains "utrumque uno sermone significavit" by "crastinum scil. dicendo, hodiernum includens diem," which seems to me meaningless.

accept the etymology offered, as furnishing a ready answer to an Arian objection.

When St. Jerome (about A.D. 383) revised the Latin of the New Testament, he substituted *supersubstantialem* for *quotidianum* in the text of St. Matthew; but, either prevented by scruples from erasing a cherished expression from the Latin Bibles, or feeling some misgiving about the correctness of his own rendering, he allowed *quotidianum* to stand in St. Luke. Altogether his language is vague and undecided whenever he has occasion to mention the word. In his Commentary on the Epistle to Titus (*Op.*, vii., p. 726), written about A.D. 387, he thus expresses himself: "Unde et illud, quod in evangelio secundum Latinos interpretes scriptum est *Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie*, melius in Græco habetur *Panem nostrum ἐπιούσιον*, id est *præcipuum*, *egregium*, *peculiarem*,* eum videlicet qui de cælo descendens ait (Joh. vi., 51), *Ego sum panis qui de cælo descendi*. Absit quippe ut nos, qui in crastinum cogitare prohibemur, de pane isto qui post paululum concoquendus et abjiciendus est in secessum in prece dominica rogare jubeamur. Nec multum differt inter *ἐπιούσιον* et *περιούσιον*; præpositio enim tantummodo est mutata, non verbum. Quidam *ἐπιούσιον* existimant in oratione dominica panem dictum, quod super omnes *οὐσίας* sit, hoc est super universas substantias. Quod si accipitur, non multum ab eo sensu differt quem exposuimus. Quidquid enim egregium est et præcipuum, extra omnia est et super omnia." And similarly in his Commentary on St. Matthew (*Op.*, vii., p. 34), written a few years afterward (A.D. 398): "Quod nos *supersubstantialem* expressimus, in Græco habetur *ἐπιούσιον*, quod verbum Septuaginta interpretes *περιούσιον* frequentissime transferunt. . . . Possumus supersubstantialem panem et aliter intellegere, qui super omnes substantias sit et universas superet creaturas. Alii simpliciter putant, secundum apostoli sermonem dicentis *Habentes victum et vestitum his contenti simus*, de præsenti tantum cibo sanctos curam agere." Hitherto he is apparently consistent with himself in connecting the word with *οὐσία*, but in a later work, the Commentary on Ezekiel (*Op.*, v., p. 209), written from A.D. 411–414, he says, "Melius est ut intelligamus panem justi eum esse qui dicit, *Ego sum panis vivus qui de cælo descendi*, et quem in oratione nobis tribui deprecamur, *Panem nostrum substantivum*, sive *superventurum*, *da nobis*, ut quem postea semper accepturi sumus, in præsenti sæculo quotidie mereamur accipere." And in a still later work against the Pelagians, written about A.D. 415, he speaks with the same uncertainty (iii., 15, ii., p. 800): "Sic docuit apostolos suos ut quotidie in corporis illius sacrificio credentes audeant loqui *Pater noster*, *etc.* . . . . *Panem quotidianum*, sive *super omnes substantias*, venturum apostoli deprecantur ut digni sint assumtione corporis Christi." In one point only is he consistent throughout. He insists on a spiritual, as opposed to a literal, interpretation of the bread.

The indecision, or the scruple, or the carelessness which led Jerome to retain *quotidianum* in one evangelist while he removed it from another, bore strange fruit. Jerome's revised Latin Version became the Bible of the Western churches. The knowledge of the Greek tongue died out. The fact that the same word *ἐπιούσιον* occurs in both Gospels passed out of memory. The

* It thus appears that the sense which St. Jerome himself attaches to his rendering *supersubstantialem* is different from that which some theologians have assigned to it.

difference which was found in the Latin Vulgate came to be regarded as a difference in the language of the evangelists themselves. As such it is commented upon by the most learned Latin writers in successive ages. So it is treated even by his own younger contemporary Cassianus, who, though himself not ignorant of Greek, yet in a treatise written soon after the death of St. Jerome, writes (*Collat.*, ix., 21), "*Panem nostrum ἐπιούσιον*, id est, supersubstantialem, *da nobis hodie;* quod alius evangelista *quotidianum.*" So, again, it is taken by Anselm in the 11th or 12th century (*Comm. in Matth.*), by Nicolas of Lyra in the 14th (*Comm. in Matth.*), and by Dionysius Carthusianus in the 15th (*Enarr. in Matth.*),* all of whom remark on the different epithets used by St. Matthew and St. Luke.

But the most remarkable instance of this blunder is furnished by a controversy between the two foremost men of their time, St. Bernard and Abelard. The Abbot of Clairvaux, having occasion to visit the convent of the Paraclete, of which Heloise was abbess, observed that in repeating the Lord's Prayer at the daily hours a change was made in the usual form, the word "supersubstantialem" being substituted for "quotidianum." As Heloise had made this change under the direction of Abelard, she communicated the complaint to him. Upon this he wrote a letter of defense to St. Bernard, which is extant (P. Abælardi *Opera*, i., p. 618, ed. Cousin). He pleads that the form in St. Matthew must be more authentic than the form in St. Luke, the former having been an apostle, and heard the words as uttered, the latter having derived his information at second-hand—"de ipso fonte Matthæus, de rivulo fontis Lucas est potatus." Hence St. Matthew's form is more complete, and contains seven petitions, while St. Luke's has only five. For this reason, the Church, in her offices, has rightly preferred St. Matthew's form to St. Luke's. "What may have been the reason, therefore," he proceeds, "that while we retain the rest of St. Matthew's words, we change one only, saying *quotidianum* for *supersubstantialem*,† let him state who can, if indeed it is sufficient to state it. For the word *quotidianum* does not seem to express the excellence of this bread, like *supersubstantialem;* and it seems to be an act of no slight

* See Pfeiffer, l. c., p. 119 seq.

† We may pardon the mistake of Abelard more readily when we find that a learned modern historian, commenting on the incident, is guilty of a still greater error. Milman (*History of Latin Christianity*, iii., p. 262, ed. 2) remarks on this dispute: "The question was the clause in the Lord's Prayer, *our daily bread*, or *our bread day by day.*" Here two wholly different things are confused together. (1.) St. Matthew and St. Luke alike have *ἐπιούσιον*. This was rendered *quotidianum* in both evangelists in the old Latin, as it is rendered *daily* in both in our English Version. But Jerome, by substituting *supersubstantialem* in St. Matthew, and retaining *quotidianum* in St. Luke, made an artificial variation, which misled Abelard. Meanwhile the *quotidianum* of the Old Latin in St. Matthew maintained its place in the Service-books, and puzzled Abelard by its presence. Abelard's remarks are confined solely to the epithet attached to *ἄρτον*. (2.) There is a real difference between St. Matthew and St. Luke in another part of the sentence, the former having *σήμερον, this day*, the latter *τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, day by day.* This distinction was obliterated by the Old Latin, which took the false reading *σημερον* in St. Luke, and so gave *hodie* in both evangelists. It reappears again in the original Vulgate of Jerome, which has *hodie* in St. Matthew and *cotidie* in St. Luke (though once more obliterated in the Clementine recension). Of this difference Dean Milman seems to have had some not very clear idea, and to have confused it with the dispute about *ἐπιούσιον*, but Abelard does not mention it at all.

presumption to correct the words of an apostle, and to make up one prayer out of two evangelists, in such a manner that neither seems to be sufficient in respect of it (the prayer), and to recite it in a form in which it was neither spoken by the Lord nor written by any of the evangelists, especially when, in all other portions of their writings which are read in church, their words are kept separate, however much they may differ in respect of completeness or incompleteness (impermixta sunt verba eorum, quacunque perfectione vel imperfectione discrepent). Therefore, if any one blames me for innovating in this matter, let him consider whether blame is not rather due to the person who presumed out of two prayers written in old times to make up one new prayer, which deserves rather to be called his own than an evangelist's (non tam evangelicam quam suam dicendam). Lastly, the discernment of the Greeks, whose authority (as St. Ambrose saith) is greater, hath, owing to the aforesaid reasons, as I suppose, brought the prayer of St Matthew alone into common use, saying *τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον*, which is translated *Panem nostrum supersubstantialem.*" Strange it is, that, though quoting the Greek words of St. Matthew (apparently, however, at second-hand), Abelard did not take the trouble to consult the original of St. Luke, but here, as elsewhere,* allowed himself to follow the Vulgate implicitly. Strange too, but less strange, that he should not have recognized in the *quotidianum* of the Church services the remnant of an older version, which in this instance Jerome's revision had been powerless to displace. We do not hear that St. Bernard refuted his pertinacious adversary by exposing his error. It is improbable that he possessed the learning necessary for this purpose, for in learning, at least, he was no match for his brilliant opponent. He probably fell back on the usage of the Church, and refused to cross weapons with so formidable an adversary.

Yet, notwithstanding such notices as these, the marvel is that Jerome's *supersubstantialis* took so little hold upon the Latin Church at large. When, after some generations, his revised Vulgate superseded the Old Latin, the word confronted students of the Bible in St. Matthew, and in this position it was commented upon and discussed. But here its influence ended. St. Augustine, on the morrow of Jerome's revision, still continues to quote and to explain the petition with the word *quotidianum*, as St. Hilary† had quoted and explained it on the eve. Despite the great name of Jerome, whose authority reigned paramount in Western Christendom for many centuries in all matters of scriptural interpretation, *quotidianum* was never displaced in the Lord's Prayer as used in the offices of the Church. Roman, Gallican, Ambrosian, and Mozarabic Liturgies all retained it. The word *supersubstantialem* is not, so far as I can learn, once substituted for *quotidianum* in any public services of the Latin Church.‡ The use which Abelard introduced at the Paraclete

* Abelard uses similar language elsewhere, *In Diebus Rogat. Serm.*, *Op.*, i., p. 471: "Non sine admiratione videtur accipiendum quod apud nos in consuetudinem ecclesiæ venerit ut quum orationem dominicam in verbis Matthæi frequentemus, qui eam, ut dictum est, perfectius scripserit, unum ejus verbum cæteris omnibus retentis commutemus, pro *supersubstantialem* scilicet, quod ipse posuit, dicentes *quotidianum*, sicut Lucas ait, etc." On the other hand, in the *Expositio Orationis Dominicæ* (i., p. 599 seq.), he comments on *quotidianum*, and does not even mention *supersubstantialem*.

† Fragm., *Op.*, ii., p. 714.

‡ It has been pointed out to me that the words "panem nostrum quotidianum su-

was obviously isolated and exceptional, and appears to have been promptly suppressed. The devotional instinct of the Church would seem to have been repelled by a scholastic term so little in harmony with our Lord's mode of speaking, and so ill adapted to religious worship. Even in the *Catechismus ad Parochos*, issued by the Council of Trent as a manual for the guidance of the Roman clergy, and containing a very full exposition of the Lord's Prayer, the word *quotidianum* is retained, while the alternative *supersubstantialem* is not once mentioned, though a eucharistic application is given to the petition, and the epithet *quotidianum* explained in accordance therewith.*

The pre-Reformation versions of the Lord's Prayer in the languages of Western Europe, being derived from the Latin, naturally follow the rendering which the translator in each case had before him. If taken from the Old Latin or from the Service-books, they give *daily;* if from the Vulgate, *supersubstantial*. Among a large number of versions and paraphrases of the Lord's Prayer in the various Teutonic dialects,† the latter rendering occurs very rarely, and then (for the most part) only *in situ* in the Gospel of St. Matthew, as, e. g., "ofer-wistlic" in the Lindisfarne Gospels, and "over other substaunce" in Wicliffe.

The early Reformers also, for the most part, adopted the familiar rendering. In Luther's Version it is interpreted "unser täglich brodt," and Calvin also advocates the derivation from ἐπιέναι. So, too, it is taken in the Latin of Leo Juda. Our own Tyndale rendered it in the same way, and in all the subsequent English versions of the Reformed Church this rendering is retained. On the other hand, the derivation from οὐσία was adopted by Beza,‡ whose interpretation, however, in this particular instance, does not appear to have influenced the Reformed versions.§

To sum up the results of this investigation into the testimony of the most ancient versions: The Syrian, the Egyptian, the Latin churches, are distinct from one another, yet all alike bear witness in the earliest forms of the Lord's Prayer to the one derivation of ἐπιούσιον as against the other. In the Syrian churches we have testimony from two distinct sources. The Egyptian churches likewise tell the same tale with a twofold utterance. All may be regarded as prior to Origen, the first Greek father who discusses the meaning

persubstantialem" occur in the Breviary in the Orationum Actio post Missam, the two epithets being combined; but this is only an indirect reference to the Lord's Prayer.

* It is worthy of notice, as showing how little favor this rendering found, that a Roman Catholic commentator of the 16th century, Maldonatus (on Matth. vi., 11), supposes that Jerome never intended to place *supersubstantialem* in the text, and that it got there by carelessness: "Hieronymus supersubstantialem vertit, quamquam in eo veterem versionem noluit corrigere. Itaque incaute quidam nostro tempore in vulgata editione pro quotidiano supersubstantialem posuerunt." This view is quite groundless.

† See the collection in Marsh's *Origin and History of the English Language*, p. 76 seq.; and also *The Gospel of St. Matthew in Anglo-Saxon and Northumbrian Versions* (Cambr., 1858).

‡ Indeed, he himself, though he explains the word "qui nostris viribus sustentandis sufficiat," yet retains *quotidianum* in the text, saying "Mihi religio fuit quicquam immutare in hac precationis formula in ecclesia Dei tanto jam tempore usurpata."

§ In Tomson's Version of the N. T., however, which is attached to the Geneva Bible, though it is rendered "dayly," a marginal note is added, "That that is meete for our nature for our dayly foode, or such as may suffice our nature and complexion."

of the word. In the Syrian and the Latin churches we have seen how, at a later date, the scholastic interpretation was superposed upon the traditional, but with different success. In the former it ultimately prevailed; in the latter it never obtained more than a precarious footing. The Egyptian churches, being more effectually isolated from Greek influences, preserved the traditional sense to the end.

These versions alone have any *traditional* value. But others, which were made in the fourth century and later, are not without their importance, as showing how widely the older interpretation still prevailed in the Greek Church, notwithstanding the tendency in the Greek fathers towards the derivation adopted or invented by Origen. It is a remarkable fact that all the remaining versions which can with probability be assigned to the fourth or fifth centuries give the temporal sense to ἐπιούσιον, or (in other words) derive it from ἐπιέναι. In the GOTHIC, whose date is about the middle of the fourth century, it is rendered by *sinteinan*, "continual;" in the ARMENIAN, which was made some time before the middle of the fifth, being begun from the Syriac, and afterwards revised and completed from the Greek, it is likewise translated "continual, daily;" and similarly in the ÆTHIOPIC, whose date is somewhat uncertain, it is given "of each day" in both St. Matthew and St. Luke.

Thus tradition is not only not adverse to the derivation which etymological considerations seem to require, but favors it very decidedly. With this strong confirmation, we need not hesitate to adopt it. On the other hand, it is only fair to notice that, though tradition is in accordance with itself and with etymology so far as regards the derivation from ἐπιέναι, yet the same degree of coincidence can not be claimed on behalf of the derivation from the feminine ἐπιοῦσα, and the more precise meaning *for the coming day* thus obtained. Yet this meaning seems to be supported by the *oldest* tradition, and to offer a better justification of the coinage of a new word. At the same time, when the word was once in use, it would require a conscious effort of the mind to separate two etymologies so intimately connected, and the close alliance of meaning, *for the coming day* and *for the coming time*, would encourage a certain vagueness of conception within these narrow limits. It was only when the meaning was stereotyped by translation into another language that it would assume definitely the one or the other of these two allied senses.

Thus the familiar rendering "daily," which has prevailed uninterruptedly in the Western Church from the beginning, is a fairly adequate representation of the original; nor, indeed, does the English language furnish any one word which would answer the purpose so well.

## II.

The word ἐπιούσιος was connected, as we have seen, by several of the fathers with περιούσιος. I hope that sufficient reasons have been given already for rejecting this connection as based on a false analogy. But still the word περιούσιος is important in itself, and (as its meaning has been somewhat misunderstood by modern as well as by ancient commentators) I take this opportunity of explaining what seems to be its proper force.

Origen (*De Orat.*, 27, i., p. 246), in the passage of which I have already quoted the context (p. 163 seq.), distinguishes these two words, ἐπιούσιος, πε-

ριούσιος, as follows: *ἡ μὲν τὸν εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν συμβαλλόμενον ἄρτον ἐληλοῦσα, ἡ δὲ τὸν περὶ τὴν οὐσίαν καταγινόμενον λαὸν καὶ κοινωνοῦντα αὐτῷ.* With this brief account of the word he contents himself. Apparently he understands *περιούσιος* to mean "connected with and participating in absolute being," thus assigning to it a sense closely allied to that which he has given to *ἐπιούσιος*. This meaning may be dismissed at once. It does not correspond with the original Hebrew, and it is an impossible sense to attach to the word itself. Nevertheless, it is taken up by Victorinus, who writes (*c. Arium*, i., 31, *Bibl. Vet. Patr.*, viii., p. 163, ed. Galland.), "Sic rursus et Paullus in Epistola ad Titum *populum περιούσιον*, circa substantiam, hoc est circa vitam consistentem populum;" and again (ii., 8, ib., p. 177), "Latinus cum non intelligeret *περιούσιον ὄχλον, περιούσιον, τὸν περιόντα* [read *περὶ ὄντα?*] id est, circa vitam quam Christus et habet et dat, posuit *populum abundantem*." And Cyril of Alexandria on St. Luke (Mai, ii., p. 266), in the context of a passage already quoted (p. 170), likewise connects it with *ἐπιούσιος*, giving it an equally impossible sense, *ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπιουσιον τὸν περιούσιον εἰπών, τουτέστι τὸν ἀρκοῦντα καὶ τοῦ τελείως ἔχειν οὐχ ἡττώμενον.*

On the other hand, Jerome (on Tit. ii., 14, vii., p. 725 seq.) says that, having thought much over the word *περιούσιον*, and consulted "the wise of this world" whether they had met with it elsewhere, without getting any satisfaction, he betook him to the passages in the Old Testament where it occurs, and by a comparison of these arrived at the meaning *egregium, praecipuum, peculiarem*, a sense which (as we have seen) he gives to *ἐπιούσιον* also. Though wholly wrong as applied to *ἐπιούσιον*, this meaning is fairly adequate to represent *περιούσιον*; but it is clear from the context that Jerome does not seize the exact force of the word, which appears also to have escaped later commentators.

We may reasonably infer from the notices of Origen and Jerome that this word was unknown out of Biblical Greek, and we have therefore no choice but to follow the method of the latter, and investigate the passages of the Old Testament where it occurs.

The expression *λαὸς περιούσιος* is found four times in the LXX.: Exodus xix., 5; Deut. vii., 6; xiv., 2; xxvi., 18. In the first passage it is a rendering of the single word סְגֻלָּה, in the three last of עַם סְגֻלָּה. Moreover, in Psa. cxxxiv. (cxxxv.), 4, לִסְגֻלָּתוֹ is translated *εἰς περιουσιασμὸν ἑαυτῷ*. In all these passages the reference is to the Israelites as the peculiar people of God. Once more, in Eccles. ii., 8 we have *συνήγαγόν μοι καίγε ἀργύριον καίγε χρυσίον καὶ περιουσιασμοὺς βασιλέων καὶ τῶν χωρῶν*, where again *περιουσιασμοὺς* represents סְגֻלָּה, but in this instance without any reference to the chosen people. These appear to be the only passages in the LXX. where *περιούσιος, περιουσιασμός* occur. But סְגֻלָּה is found, besides, in two other places: in Mal. iii., 17, where again it refers to the chosen people, and where it is rendered *εἰς περιποίησιν*; and in 1 Chron. xxix., 3, where Solomon says, "I have a סְגֻלָּה [translated in our version "of mine own proper good"], gold and silver which I have given to the house of my God, over and above all that I have prepared for the holy house," rendered by the LXX. *ἔστι μοι ὃ περιπεποίημαι χρυσίον καὶ ἀργύριον, κ.τ.λ.*

Of these two renderings which the LXX. offers for סְגֻלָּה, the one is adopt-

ed by St. Paul, Tit. ii., 14, λαὸς *περιούσιος*, the other by St. Peter, 1 Pet. ii., 9, λαὸς *εἰς περιποίησιν*. The reference in St. Peter is to Exod. xix., 5, where, however, the rendering *περιούσιος* is found in the LXX.

The Hebrew root סגלה, from which סגלה comes, is not found in the Bible. But the senses of kindred roots in Hebrew, such as סגר, and of other derivatives of this same root in the allied languages, point to its meaning. It signifies "to surround on all sides," and so to "gather together, set apart, reserve, appropriate."

In grammar, the Rabbinical expression for a *proper name* is שם סגילה. In logic, the predicable *proprium* is designated סגולה by them.

Applied to property, the word סגלה would denote the private treasure which a person acquires for himself, or possesses by himself alone, as distinguished from that which he shares with others. Of a king, we might say that it was the "fiscus" as distinguished from the "ærarium," the privy purse as opposed to the public treasury. It is something reserved for his private uses. In two of the passages where it occurs, Eccles. ii., 8; 1 Chron. xxix., 3, it refers to kings; and in the latter it seems to be carefully distinguished from the money which would naturally be devoted to expenditure on public works.

Thus there is no great difficulty about the original Hebrew word. On the other hand, it is less easy to see how the same idea can be represented by the Greek *περιούσιος*. Jerome speaks as though the leading notion of the word were "superiority," derived from *περιεῖναι* in the sense "to excel." Obviously this meaning would not correspond to the original.

We arrive at a more just conception of its force by considering a synonym which Jerome himself points out. This same Hebrew word, which in the LXX. is given *περιούσιον*, was rendered by Symmachus *ἐξαίρετον* (Hieron., *Op.*, vi., p. 34, 726). Jerome indeed is satisfied with translating *ἐξαίρετον* by *præcipuum* or *egregium*, but its meaning is much more precise and forcible. It was used especially of the portion which was set apart as the share of the king, or general, before the rest of the spoils were distributed by lot or otherwise to the soldiers of the victorious army. The exemption from the common mode of apportionment in favor of rank or virtue is the leading idea of the word. Thus, in Plutarch, *Vit. Cor.*, 10, we are told that when Coriolanus, as a reward for his bravery, was asked to select from the spoils ten of every kind before the distribution to the rest (*ἐξέλεσθαι δέκα πάντα πρὸ τοῦ νέμειν τοῖς ἄλλοις*), he declined to do so, saying that he would take his chance with the others; but he added, *ἐξαίρετον μίαν αἰτοῦμαι χάριν*, "I have one favor to ask as an *exceptional boon*." In the triumphant anticipation of Sisera's mother, "Have they not divided the prey? to every man [lit., to the head of a man] a damsel or two, to Sisera a prey of divers colors, etc." we have the idea which a Greek poet might express by *ἐξαίρετον δώρημα* (e. g., Æsch., *Eum.*, 380; comp. *Agam.*, 927), the special treasure assigned to the captain over and above the distribution which was made to the rest, counted by heads. This sense of *ἐξαίρετον* is too common to need farther illustration; and I can not doubt that Symmachus selected it on this account as an appropriate word to express the idea of the original. The leading idea is not *superiority*, as Jerome seems to imagine, but *exception*. "Egregium," strictly interpreted,

might represent it, but not "præcipuum." It is the "exsortem ducere honorem" of Virgil. This idea fitly expresses the relations of Jehovah to Israel, whom in the language of the Old Testament elsewhere he retained under his special care (see the notes on Clem. Rom., 29).

The same conception seems to be involved in *περιούσιος*. This word may have been invented by the LXX. translators, or it may have had some local currency in their age; but, if the latter was the case, the fact was unknown to Origen and Jerome, for they speak of *περιούσιος* as not occurring out of the Bible. In either case, it might be derived from *περιών*, on the analogy of *ἑκούσιος*, *ἐθελούσιος*, etc., or from *οὐσία*, like *ἐνούσιος*, *ἀνούσιος*, etc. (see above, p. 200, 201). Thus its meaning would be either "existing over and above," or "possessed over and above," and the same idea of exception from the common laws of distribution would be involved as in *ἐξαίρετος*.

St. Jerome mentions also* that in another passage Symmachus had adopted the Latin word *peculiarem* as a rendering of סגלה. He doubtless ventured on this bold expedient because the Greek language did not furnish so exact an equivalent as *peculium*, for *ἐξαίρετον*, adequate as it is in some respects, introduces the new idea of division of *spoils*, which is wanting in the original. On the other hand, the Latin *peculium*, being used to denote the private purse which a member of the family, whether slave or free, was allowed in particular cases to possess and accumulate for his own use, distinct from the property which the paterfamilias administered for the good of the whole, approached very closely to the meaning of the Hebrew; and, moreover, there was a convenient adjective *peculiaris* derived therefrom. Impressed, it would appear, with the value of the word which he had thus learned from Symmachus, Jerome himself has almost universally adopted *peculium*, *peculiaris*, as a rendering of סגלה in the Old Testament; e. g., Exod. xix., 5, "Eritis mihi *in peculium* de cunctis populis;" 1 Chron. xxix., 3, "Quæ obtuli in domum Dei mei *de peculio*;" Deut. xxvi., 18 (comp. vii., 6; xiv., 2), "Elegit te hodie ut sis ei populus *peculiaris*," etc.†

Our English translators, in adopting this word "peculiar" after the Vulgate, were obviously aware of its appropriate technical sense. This appears from the mode in which they use it; e. g., Psa. cxxxv., 4, "The Lord hath chosen Jacob unto himself, and Israel for his *peculiar treasure*" (comp. Exod. xix., 5; Eccles. ii., 8, in both which passages the word "treasure" is added). Twice only have they departed from the word "peculiar" in rendering סגלה: in Deut. vii., 6, where it is translated "a *special* people," and in Mal. iii., 17, where it is represented by "jewels," but with a marginal alternative, "spe-

* Hieron., *Op.*, vi., p. 34, "licet in quodam loco *peculiare* interpretatus sit," *ib.*, vi., p. 726, "in alio volumine Latino sermone uteus *peculiarem* interpretatus est." Different interpretations of this second passage have been given, but, compared with the first, it can only mean that "in another book of Scripture Symmachus adopted a Latin expression, translating the word by *peculiarem*," just in the same way as Ignatius, writing in Greek, uses *δεσέρτωρ*, *δεπόσιτα*, *ἄκκεπτα* (*Polyc.*, 6), because the Greek language did not supply such convenient terms to express his meaning. It is extremely improbable that Symmachus wrote any work in Latin, as some have supposed.

† The normal rendering in the Old Latin (which was translated from the LXX.) was *abundans*: see, e. g., Exod. xix., 5; Tit. ii., 14; and the quotation of Victorinus given above (p. 174–5). This would be a very natural interpretation of *περιοισιος* to any one unacquainted with the Hebrew.

cial treasure." In this last passage the rendering should probably be, "And they shall be to me, saith the Lord of Hosts, in the day which I appoint, for a peculiar treasure," and not, as our version has it, "And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of Hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels." In Tit. ii., 14, λαὸς περιούσιος, and 1 Pet. ii., 9, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, where (as I have already observed) we have two distinct Greek renderings of the same Hebrew, the expressions are once more united in our version, which, following Tyndale, translates both by "a peculiar people." Strangely enough, St. Jerome, who introduces *peculium*, *peculiaris*, in the Old Testament, has other and diverse renderings in both these passages of the New; *populus acceptabilis* in the one case, and *populus adquisitionis* in the other. His New Testament was executed before his Old; and it would appear that in the interval he had recognized the value of the rendering suggested by Symmachus, and adopted it accordingly.

# INDEX I.*


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Matt. i., 1 | 93 |
| " i., 2, 3 | 137 |
| " i., 6 | 95 |
| " i., 22..87 (bis), | 109 |
| " ii., 4 | 94 |
| " ii., 5 | 109 |
| " ii., 6 | 137 |
| " ii., 15 | 84, 109 |
| " ii., 17 | 109, 135 |
| " iii., 1 | 90 |
| " iii., 3 | 109 |
| " iii., 4 | 105 |
| " iii., 13 | 90 |
| " iii., 14 | 91 |
| " iii., 15, 16 | 116 |
| " iv., 5 | 100 |
| " iv., 6 | 112 |
| " iv., 8 | 102 |
| " iv., 13 | 148 |
| " v., 1 | 101 |
| " v., 15....52–3, 101, 107, 144. | |
| " v., 16 | 52–3 |
| " v., 32 | 73 |
| " vi., 11....163–180 | |
| " vi., 13 | 44 |
| " vi., 16, 18 | 116 |
| " vi., 25....145, | 167 |
| " vi., 31 | 145 |
| " vi., 34. 145, 166, | 167 |
| " viii., 12 | 97 |
| " ix., 16 | 125 |
| " x., 4 | 121, 122 |
| " x., 9 | 85 |
| " x., 16 | 120 |
| " x., 29....141, | 142 |
| " xi., 2 | 94 |
| " xii., 1, 5, 10, 11, 12. | 127 |
| " xii., 18 | 124 |
| " xiii., 20....57, | 149 |
| " xiii., 21 | 149 |
| " xiii., 24, 25 | 71 |
| " xiii., 33 | 144 |
| " xiii., 42, 50 | 97 |
| Matt. xiii., 55 | 137 |
| " xiv., 8 | 120 |
| " xv., 3, 6 | 111 |
| " xv., 22 | 148 |
| " xv., 27 | 121 |
| " xv., 35 | 118 |
| " xvi., 9, 10 | 74 |
| " xvi., 14 | 73 |
| " xvi., 16 | 135 |
| " xvi., 17 | 94 |
| " xvi., 25 | 137 |
| " xvi., 26 | 64 |
| " xvii., 1 | 56, 64 |
| " xvii., 10 | 102 |
| " xvii., 21 | 131 |
| " xvii., 24 *seq.* | 43 |
| " xvii., 25 | 143 |
| " xviii., 6, 7 | 150 |
| " xviii., 24 *seq.* (bis). | 150 |
| " xviii., 33 | 143 |
| " xix., 8 | 46 |
| " xix., 9 | 87 |
| " xix., 17 | 73 |
| " xix., 19 | 44 |
| " xx., 2, 9, 10, 13. | 137 |
| " xx., 20 | 142 |
| " xxi., 4...86, 87, | 46 |
| " xxi., 12....79, | 109 |
| " xxi., 33 *seq.* | 101 |
| " xxii., 1 *seq.* | 72 |
| " xxii., 9, 10 | 73 |
| " xxii., 13 | 71 |
| " xxiii., 6 | 97 |
| " xxiii., 7, 8 | 53 |
| " xxiii., 24..154, | 139 |
| " xxiii., 35 | 155 |
| " xxiv., 5 | 79 |
| " xxiv., 12 | 94 |
| " xxiv., 15 | 92 |
| " xxiv., 21 | 109 |
| " xxiv., 27 | 87 |
| " xxiv., 30 | 115 |
| Matt. xxiv., 51 | 112 |
| " xxv., 6 | 97 |
| " xxv., 14 *seq.* | 87 |
| " xxv., 30 | 143 |
| " xxv., 32 | 97 |
| " xxv., 46 | 46 |
| " xxvi., 15 | 51 |
| " xxvi., 25 | 123 |
| " xxvi., 36 | 139 |
| " xxvi., 48 | 125 |
| " xxvi., 49...71, | 71, 139 |
| " xxvi., 50 | 114 |
| " xxvi., 56....86, | 87 |
| " xxvi., 63 | 94 |
| " xxvi., 64 | 112 |
| " xxvi., 69, 71... | 103 |
| " xxvii., 9 | 44 |
| " xxvii., 15 | 105 |
| " xxvii., 27 | 57 |
| " xxvii., 33 | 138 |
| " xxvii., 35 | 109 |
| " xxviii., 19..40, | 113 |
| Mark i., 1 | 44, 94 |
| " i., 21 | 127 |
| " ii., 15, 16 | 104 |
| " ii., 21 | 125 |
| " ii., 23 | 127 |
| " iii., 2, 4 | 127 |
| " iii., 5 | 120 |
| " iii., 18 | 121 |
| " iv., 16 | 57 |
| " iv., 21....101, | 144 |
| " iv., 29 | 123 |
| " v., 13 | 101 |
| " vi., 3 | 137 |
| " vi., 27 | 141 |
| " vi., 37 | 142 |
| " vi., 52 | 120 |
| " vii., 9 | 111 |
| " vii., 26 | 135 |
| " vii., 31 | 148 |
| " viii., 19, 20 | 73 |
| " viii., 29 | 94 |


* I owe this index of passages to the kindness of Mr. A. A. Van Sittart.

Page

MARK viii., 36..... 56
" ix., 2..... 102
" ix., 5..... 139
" ix., 29..... 43
" ix., 41..... 94, 95
" x., 51..... 139
" xi., 4..... 101
" xi., 15..... 101
" xi., 21..... 139
" xii., 26..... 112
" xii., 39..... 53
" xii., 42..... 141
" xiii., 14..... 109
" xiii., 28..... 118
" xiv., 5..... 142
" xiv., 32..... 125
" xiv., 45..... 139
" xiv., 53, 54.... 116
" xiv., 66, 69.... 103
" xv., 6..... 105
" xv., 16..... 57
" xv., 22..... 138
" xvi., 9–20..... 42

LUKE i., 1..... 124
" i., 39.....102, 137
" i., 59..... 91
" i., 63..... 147
" i., 65..... 102
" ii., 11..... 94
" ii., 18..... 107
" ii., 24..... 101
" ii., 33..... 43
" ii., 36..... 133
" iii., 23..... 113
" iii., 24..... 136
" iii., 26..... 137
" iii., 27..... 136
" iii., 30.....136, 138
" iii., 33..... 137
" iv., 5..... 102
" iv., 9..... 100
" iv., 11..... 112
" iv., 20..... 147
" vi., 15..... 121
" vi., 16..... 105
" vi., 17..... 101
" vi., 36..... 76
" vii., 4..... 149
" vii., 5..... 101
" vii., 33, 34..... 90
" vii., 41..... 142
" vii., 45, 46..... 71
" viii., 14..... 57
" ix., 25..... 56

Page

LUKE ix., 55..... 43
" x., 35..... 142
" xi., 3.....163–180
" xi., 33.....101, 144
" xi., 51..... 79
" xii., 6.....141, 142
" xii., 35..... 107
" xiii., 6..... 119
" xiii., 21..... 144
" xiii., 23..... 90
" xiii., 28..... 98
" xv., 8.....143 (bis)
" xv., 9..... 143
" xvi., 6, 7..... 144
" xvii., 1, 2..... 150
" xviii., 12..... 85
" xviii., 31..... 109
" xix., 13, 52, 143, 150
" xix., 15..... 52
" xx., 37..... 112
" xxi., 19..... 85
" xxii., 1..... 139
" xxii., 43, 44..... 43
" xxiii., 2..... 94
" xxiii., 5..... 138
" xxiii., 17..... 105
" xxiii., 33..... 138
" xxiii., 34..... 43
" xxiii., 35, 39.. 94
" xxiv., 10..... 93

JOHN i., 3 .....81, 110 (bis)
" i., 7.....107, 110
" i., 8..... 106
" i., 9..... 107
" i., 10.....110 (bis)
" i., 11..... 72
" i., 14..... 63
" i., 16..... 96
" i., 17.....94, 110
" i., 18.....37, 42
" i., 21..... 95
" i., 25.....94, 95
" i., 29..... 124
" i., 39..... 139
" i., 43..... 137
" i., 50..... 139
" ii., 6..... 144
" iii., 2..... 139
" iii., 8..... 63
" iii., 10..... 99
" iii., 19..... 107
" iii., 26..... 139
" iv., 5..... 125
" iv., 6..... 74

Page

JOHN iv., 27..... 104
" iv., 31..... 139
" iv., 37..... 106
" v., 1..... 105
" v., 3, 4..... 44
" v., 35..... 106
" v., 44..... 106
" vi., 4..... 105
" vi., 7..... 142
" vi., 14..... 95
" vi., 22 *seq.*..... 103
" vi., 25..... 139
" vi., 51..... 176
" vi., 69..... 94
" vii., 1..... 138
" vii., 19, 20..... 151
" vii., 25..... 151
" vii., 26..... 94
" vii., 40..... 95
" viii., 1–11..... 42
" viii., 58..... 76
" ix., 2..... 139
" ix., 5..... 107
" ix., 22..... 94
" x., 16..... 73
" xi., 8..... 139
" xi., 14..... 153
" xii., 5..... 142
" xii., 6..... 124
" xii., 13..... 100
" xii., 40..... 120
" xiii., 12..... 74
" xiii., 23, 25..... 74
" xiii., 27..... 114
" xiv., 5, 6..... 96
" xiv., 16 *seq.*58, 60, 61
" xiv., 18..... 60
" xiv., 26 .....58, 60
" xv., 3..... 111
" xv., 26....58, 60, 61
" xvi., 1, 4, 6..... 47
" xvi., 7.....58, 60
" xvi., 30..... 50
" xvii., 3..... 94
" xviii., 1..... 125
" xviii., 28, 33... 57
" xviii., 39..... 105
" xix., 9..... 57
" xix., 17..... 138
" xix., 36..... 87
" xx., 16..... 139
" xx., 22.....63–4
" xx., 25..... 47
" xxi., 15, 16, 17.. 137
" xxi., 20..... 74

Page

Acts i., 3 ..... 125
" i., 13..... 121
" i., 18..... 85
" ii., 3..... 123
" ii., 11..... 135
" ii., 23 ..... 108
" ii., 27, 31..... 78
" ii., 38..... 94
" ii., 43..... 108
" ii., 47..... 90
" iii., 6..... 94
" iii., 13, 26 ..... 124
" iv., 25, 27..... 79
" iv., 27, 30..... 124
" vii., 26..... 91
" vii., 45..... 136
" viii., 5..... 105
" viii., 16..... 113
" viii., 30..... 64
" viii., 37..... 44
" ix., 2..... 96
" ix., 35.....100, 133
" x., 2..... 79
" x., 30..... 43
" xi., 17.....84, 106
" xi., 19..... 138
" xii., 4..... 139
" xii., 9..... 108
" xii., 12..... 135
" xii., 22..... 79
" xii., 25..... 135
" xiii., 14..... 127
" xiii., 21..... 133
" xiii., 50 ..... 126
" xiv., 13..... 126
" xv., 3..... 138
" xvi., 11..... 165
" xvi., 35, 38..... 141
" xvii., 1 ..... 101
" xvii., 2 ..... 127
" xvii., 5..... 79
" xvii., 19, 22..... 138
" xvii., 23 .....79, 150
" xvii., 29..... 126
" xviii., 12..... 140
" xviii., 14..... 149
" xix., 1..... 148
" xix., 2..... 84
" xix., 3, 5..... 113
" xix., 9..... 96
" xix., 15..... 65
" xix., 23..... 96
" xix., 30..... 79
" xix., 31..... 140
" xix., 33..... 79

Page

Acts xix., 35..... 140
" xix., 38..... 110
" xx., 2..... 135
" xx., 15..... 165
" xxi., 2..... 138
" xxi., 3..... 116
" xxi., 15..... 147
" xxi., 18..... 165
" xxi., 28..... 79
" xxi., 31..... 151
" xxi., 31, 32..... 141
" xxii., 24–26 .... 141
" xxiii., 17–23.... 141
" xxiii., 35..... 57
" xxiv., 5, 6..... 151
" xxiv., 22..... 96
" xxv., 22..... 91
" xxv., 26 ..... 68
" xxvi., 24, 25.... 47
" xxvii., 12..... 138
" xxvii., 20..... 115
" xxviii., 13..... 147
" xxviii., 15 ..138, 157
" xxviii., 16..... 141
" xxviii., 16, 29... 43

Rom. i., 29 .....148, 149
" ii., 1..... 67
" ii., 8..... 120
" ii., 12 *seq.*..... 93
" ii., 18..... 98
" ii., 22..... 126
" ii., 24..... 111
" ii., 26 ..... 120
" iii., 4, 6..... 153
" iii., 19 *seq.*..... 93
" iii., 25 ..... 119
" iii., 24–26..... 58
" iv., 3, 9..... 55
" iv., 13 *seq.*..... 93
" iv., 19 ..... 45
" iv., 22..... 55
" v., 9..... 98
" v., 15..... 84
" v., 15–19..... 92
" vi., 1 *seq.*..... 82
" vi., 2 .....82, 84
" vi., 3 .....82, 113
" vi., 4, 6..... 82
" vi., 8.....82, 84
" vi., 12, 13..... 124
" vi., 17, 18..... 82
" vi., 21..... 154
" vi., 22..... 82
" vi., 23..... 125

Page

Rom. vii., 1 *seq.*..... 93
" vii., 4..... 82
" vii., 6.....82, 84
" viii., 6 ..... 84
" viii., 11..... 111
" viii., 16..... 61
" viii., 24..... 89
" viii., 26..... 61
" ix., 3..... 91
" ix., 25..... 79
" ix., 26.....79, 135
" x., 9, 13..... 89
" x., 15..... 47
" xi., 2..... 112
" xi., 7..... 120
" xi., 8..... 122
" xi., 20..... 149
" xi., 25..... 120
" xii., 2..... 77
" xii., 3..... 64
" xii., 11..... 24
" xii., 19.....55, 98
" xiii., 11..... 84
" xiv., 14..... 113
" xiv., 22, 23..... 70
" xv., 4, 5..... 47
" xv., 32..... 98
" xvi., 1..... 104
" xvi., 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 47, 54
" xvi., 7..... 138
" xvi., 9..... 135
" xvi., 10–16....47, 54
" xvi., 19..... 120
" xvi., 23..... 140

1 Cor. i., 10..... 126
" i., 13..... 113
" i., 18..... 90
" i., 28..... 168
" ii., 13–15..... 67
" ii., 14, 15..... 67
" iii., 5..... 84
" iii., 17..... 47
" iv., 3, 4, 5..... 67
" iv., 8..... 155
" v., 9..... 99
" vi., 1–6..... 67
" vii., 5..... 43
" vii., 31..... 64
" vii., 32..... 146
" viii., 6.....110, 112
" viii., 10, 11.... 106
" ix., 3..... 67
" ix., 4..... 93
" ix., 22..... 81

| | Page |
|---|---|
| 1 Cor. x., 2 | 113 |
| " x., 16 *seq.* | 47 |
| " x., 25, 27 | 67 |
| " x., 32 | 135 |
| " xi., 28-34 | 68-9 |
| " xi., 29, 31, 32 | 67 |
| " xii., 2 | 64 |
| " xii., 4 *seq.* | 48, 54 |
| " xii., 13 | 113, 135 |
| " xii., 28 | 115 |
| " xiii., 8 | 48 |
| " xiii., 9, 12 | 66 |
| " xiv., 7 | 75 |
| " xiv., 16 | 147 |
| " xiv., 20 | 75 |
| " xiv., 23 | 154 |
| " xiv., 24, 29 | 68 |
| " xiv., 36 | 72 |
| " xv., 2 | 84, 89 |
| " xv., 4-20 | 85, 86 |
| " xv., 22 | 84 |
| " xv., 24-28 | 48 |
| " xv., 40 | 75, 76 |
| " xv., 51 | 44 |
| " xvi., 1, 2 | 48 |
| " xvi., 12 | 98 |
| " xvi., 15 | 152 |
| " xvi., 22 | 115 |
| 2 Cor. i., 1 | 135 |
| " i., 3-8 | 49 |
| " i., 9 | 71-2 |
| " i., 13 | 64 |
| " i., 19 | 135 |
| " i., 20 | 45 |
| " i., 23 | 118 |
| " ii., 6 | 93 |
| " ii., 14 | 119 |
| " ii., 15 | 90 |
| " iii., 1 | 49 |
| " iii., 2 | 64 |
| " iii., 5, 6 | 49 |
| " iii., 7 | 49 |
| " iii., 11 | 72 |
| " iii., 13 *seq.* | 49 |
| " iii., 14 | 49, 120 |
| " iii., 18 | 49 |
| " iv., 2 | 149 |
| " iv., 3 | 49 |
| " iv., 4 | 123 |
| " iv., 8 | 65 |
| " iv., 13 | 84 |
| " iv., 15 | 111 |
| " v., 6-11 | 49 |
| " v., 14 | 83 |
| 2 Cor. v., 16 | 66 |
| " vi., 9 | 66 |
| " vi., 10 | 65 |
| " vii., 7 | 50 |
| " vii., 10 | 77 |
| " vii., 11 | 99 |
| " vii., 13, 14 | 82 |
| " viii., 10-12 | 50 |
| " viii., 19 | 106 |
| " ix., 2-5 | 50 |
| " ix., 13 | 153 |
| " x., 5 | 125 |
| " x., 12 | 64, 67 |
| " x., 13, 15, 16 | 50 |
| " xi., 3 | 112 |
| " xi., 4 | 76 |
| " xi., 9 | 125 |
| " xi., 16-18 | 50 |
| " xii., 1 | 45 |
| " xii., 2 *seq.* | 86 |
| " xii., 2, 3 | 50 |
| " xii., 7 | 125 |
| " xii., 9 | 63 |
| " xii., 13 | 93 |
| " xii., 13, 14 | 125 |
| " xii., 15 | 71 |
| " xii., 17 | 81 |
| " xii., 18 | 81, 99 |
| " xii., 20 | 120, 148 |
| " xiii., 9, 11 | 126 |
| " xiii., 14 | 40 |
| Gal. i., 6 | 76 |
| " ii., 7 | 84 |
| " ii., 16-21 | 83 |
| " iii., 3 | 83 |
| " iii., 6 | 55 |
| " iii., 10 *seq.* | 93 |
| " iii., 19 | 108 |
| " iii., 27 | 83, 113 |
| " iv., 20 | 91 |
| " v., 13 | 83 |
| " v., 20 | 120 |
| " v., 24 | 83 |
| Ephes. i., 1 | 37, 168 |
| " i., 11, 13 | 83 |
| " i., 23 | 52, 96 |
| " ii., 5, 8 | 89 |
| " ii., 5, 6, 13, 14 | 83 |
| " iii., 10 | 108 |
| " iii., 19 | 96 |
| " iv., 1, 4, 7 | 83 |
| " iv., 13 | 96 |
| " iv., 18 | 120 |
| Ephes. iv., 29 | 114 |
| " iv., 30 | 83 |
| " v., 15 | 65 |
| " vi., 12 | 151 |
| Phil. i., 13 | 57 |
| " i., 14 | 92-3 |
| " i., 17 | 120 |
| " ii., 3 | 120 |
| " ii., 6 *seq.* | 78 |
| " ii., 9 | 98 |
| " ii., 13 | 50 |
| " ii., 15...115, 120 (bis) | |
| " ii., 30 | 45 |
| " iii., 2, 3 | 64 |
| " iii., 3 *seq.* | 50 |
| " iii., 14 | 151 |
| " iv., 2 | 138 |
| " iv., 2, 3 | 114 |
| " iv., 6 | 146, 167 |
| " iv., 19 | 170 (bis) |
| Col. i., 13 | 83 |
| " i., 16, 17 | 81, 110 |
| " i., 19 | 95 |
| " ii., 5 | 125 |
| " ii., 8 | 120 |
| " ii., 9 | 96 |
| " ii., 9, 10 | 52 |
| " ii., 11 *seq.* | 82 |
| " ii., 16 | 127 |
| " ii., 20 | 84 |
| " iii., 1, 3 | 82 |
| " iii., 3 | 84 |
| " iii., 8 | 152 |
| " iii., 13 | 148 |
| " iii., 15 | 83 |
| " iv., 10 | 119, 135 |
| " iv., 14 | 135 |
| 1 Thess. ii., 4 | 50 |
| " ii., 16 | 98 |
| " iv., 4 | 85 |
| " iv., 6 | 99 |
| 2 Thess. i., 6 | 50 |
| " ii., 1, 2 | 113 |
| " ii., 5 *seq.* | 97 |
| " ii., 6 | 51 |
| " ii., 7 | 51, 151 |
| " iii., 11 | 65 |
| 1 Tim. i., 4 | 155 |
| " iii., 1 | 24 |
| " iii., 3 | 127 |

Page

1 Tim. iii., 11 ..... 104
" iii., 13 ..... 150
" iii., 16.....42, 152
" v., 4 ..... 148
" v., 19 ..... 24
" vi., 2 ..... 106
" vi., 5 ..... 106
" vi., 17 ..... 149

2 Tim. i., 7, 9..... 83
" ii., 19..... 106
" iii., 4..... 149
" iv., 11..... 135

Titus i., 7..... 127
" i., 12..... 135
" ii., 14..181, 182, 184
" iii., 5 ..... 83

Philem. 2..... 156
" 24..... 135

Heb. i., 1..... 53
" i., 2..... 110
" ii., 10..... 110
" ii., 16..... 123
" iii., 11 ..... 56
" iv., 3..... 56
" iv., 8 ..... 136
" v., 2..... 152
" v., 12..... 152
" vi., 1..... 114
" vi., 7..... 111
" vi., 8, 16..... 106
" vii., 14.....86, 137
" vii., 21–24..... 86
" viii., 8..... 137
" viii., 13..... 50

Page

Heb. ix., 1 ..... 106
" ix., 6–9, 18..... 89
" ix., 28 ..... 124
" x., 1.....89, 106
" x., 30..... 55
" xi., 10 ..... 97
" xi., 31 ..... 134
" xii., 26..... 118

James i., 15 ..... 77
" i., 17 ..... 77
" ii., 2, 3..... 50
" ii., 23..... 55
" ii., 25..... 134
" iii., 5..... 123
" iii., 14, 16..... 120
" v., 9..... 148
" v., 16..... 154
" v., 20..... 55

1 Pet. i., 3 ..... 83
" i., 16 ..... 76
" i., 18 ..... 83
" ii., 4..... 113
" ii., 9.....182, 184
" ii., 10..... 79
" ii., 16..... 149
" ii., 21..... 83
" ii., 24..... 124
" iii., 9..... 83
" iii., 21..... 120
" iv., 8..... 55
" v., 7.....146, 167
" v., 13..... 135

2 Pet. ii., 1, 3..... 51
" ii., 13..... 121
" iii., 12..... 114

Page

1 John ii., 1..... 58
" iv., 9, 10, 14... 81
" v., 6..... 104
" v., 7.....39–41
" v., 9, 10..... 51

Jude 12.....119, 121 (bis)

Rev. i., 4..... 117
" i., 15..... 51
" ii., 13..... 52
" ii., 26..... 117
" iii., 12..... 117
" iii., 17.....51, 99
" iii., 21..... 117
" iv., 4..... 52
" iv., 5..... 107
" iv., 11..... 152
" v., 5..... 137
" vi., 6.....142, 144
" vii., 5..... 137
" vii., 6..... 133
" vii., 12, 14..... 97
" vii., 15..... 62
" viii., 10 ..... 107
" viii., 12..... 116
" xi., 9, 11..... 104
" xi., 16..... 52
" xiii., 6 ..... 62
" xiv., 15, 16 ..... 112
" xvi., 10 ..... 52
" xvii., 1..... 97
" xvii., 6, 7..... 51
" xviii., 2..... 51
" xviii., 23..... 115
" xix., 9..... 106
" xxi., 3..... 63
" xxi., 14, 19 *seq.*... 97
" xxi., 24..... 90

# INDEX II.


A.

Abelard on ἐπιούσιος, 177 seq., 178.
Acts of the Apostles, text of, 43.
Æthiopic rendering of ἐπιούσιος, 180.
Alford (Dean) on Revision, 56, 58, 64.
Ambiguities of expression, 151 seq.
Ambrose (St.) on ἐπιούσιος, 175 seq.
Andrewes (Bishop), 30.
Anselm, 177.
Antigenidas, 28.
Antiochene School, 169.
Aorist confused with perfect 80 seq.; its significance in St. Paul, 82; various misrenderings of, 83 seq.
Apphia, Appia, 156.
Archaisms in the English Version, 145 seq.
  by, 108.
  by-and-by, 149.
  carefulness, 146.
  carriages, 147.
  chamberlain, 140.
  coasts, 148 seq.
  comforter, 60.
  debate, 148.
  deputy, 140.
  devotions, 150.
  dishonesty, 149.
  fetch a compass, 147.
  generation, 150.
  go about to, 151.
  grudge, 148.
  high-minded, 149.
  instantly, 149.
  let, 151.
  lewdness, 149.
  maliciousness, 149.
  minister, 147.
  nephew, 148.
  occupy, 52, 150.
  of, 107.
  offend, offense, 150.
  prevent, 151.
  room, 53, 147–8.
  scrip, 147.
  thought, 145 seq.
  writing-table, 147.

Armenian rendering of ἐπιούσιος, 180.
Arnold (Mr. M.) quoted, 159 seq.
Article (the definite), neglect of, 91 seq.; insertion of, 103 seq.; general ignorance of, 105 seq.
Asiarchs, 140.
Aspirate (Hebrew) omitted in Greek, 134.
Athanasius (St.) on ἐπιούσιος, 169.
Augustine (St.) on Jerome's revision, 25, 26, 28, 32; on the heavenly witnesses, 41; on ἐπιούσιος, 178.
Authorized Version: historical parallel to, 29 seq.; translators' forebodings of, 29; never authorized, 30; gradual reception of, 30; itself a revision, 32; faulty text of, 36 seq.; distinctions created in, 46 seq.; distinctions obliterated in, 65 seq.; errors of grammar in, 80 seq.; errors of lexicography in, 118 seq.; its caprice in proper names, titles, etc., 128 seq.; archaisms in, 145 seq.; ambiguities of expression in, 151 seq.; faulty English in, 152 seq.; editorial errors and misprints in, 153 seq.; corrections in later editions of, 115, 155 seq.; variable orthography of, 156 seq.; pure English of, 159 seq.
-αῖος, adjectives in, 165.
αἴρειν, 124.
ἀκέραιος, 120.
ἄλλος, ἕτερος, 74 seq.
ἀνακρίνειν, ἀνάκρισις, 67 seq.
ἀναπίπτειν, 75 seq.
ἀνενεγκεῖν, 124.
ἀσσάριον, 141 seq.
αὐγάζειν, 123.
αὐλή, ποίμνη, 73.

B.

Barjona, 136 seq.
Basil (St.) on ἐπιούσιος, 167, 169.
Bentley quoted, 91 seq.
Bernard's (St.) controversy with Abelard, 177, 178.
Besaunt, 143.
Beza, 179.
Bible. See *Authorized Version.*

Bishops', 30, 41, 72, 73, 85, 114, 119, 122, 129, 131, 139 (bis), 141, 153, 154 (bis), 155.
Coverdale's, 41, 73, 114, 119, 122, 129, 141.
Geneva, 31, 73, 85, 114, 119, 122, 129, 131, 139 (bis), 141, 153; Testament (1557), 41, 114, 119, 122, 125, 140, 141; Tomson's Testament, 154, 179.
Great, 41, 73, 114, 119, 122, 130, 139, 141.
Rheims, 54, 73, 78, 119, 122, 140, 144, 150, 153.
Tyndale's, 41, 53, 72, 73, 78, 79, 80, 109, 114, 119, 122, 126, 141, 144, 150, 151, 152, 179, 184.
Wicliffe's (and Wicliffite), 78, 79, 119, 122, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 150, 153, 179.
Breviary, 178.
*βαστάζειν*, 124.
*βάτος*, 144.
*βωμός*, *θυσιαστήριον*, 79.

C.

Calvin, 179.
Cassianus, 177 seq.
Christ and the Christ, 93 seq.
Chrysostom (St.) on *ἐπιούσιος*, 170 seq.
Coins, rendering of, 141 seq.
Corinthians, 2d Epistle to the, recurrence of words in, 48 seq.
Coverdale's Bible. See *Bible*.
Cretans, Cretes, Cretians, 135.
Cureton, 172.
Cyprian (St.), 41, 174.
Cyril (St.) of Alexandria on *ἐπιούσιος*, 170; on *περιούσιος*, 181.
Cyril (St.) of Jerusalem on *ἐπιούσιος*, 169.
*καίεσθαι*, 107.
*Καναναῖος*, *Κανανίτης*, 121.
*κατάνυξις*, *κατανύσσειν*, 122.
*καταρτίζειν*, 126.
*κόλπος*, *στῆθος*, 74.
*κόρος*, 144.
*κόφινοι*, *σπυρίδες*, 73.
*κρίνειν* and its compounds, 67 seq.
*κτᾶσθαι*, *κεκτῆσθαι*, 85 seq.
*χοῖνιξ*, 143, 144.
*χωρίον*, 125.

D.

Damascene (St. John) on *ἐπιούσιος*, 170.
Damasus, Pope, 23, 28.
Deaconesses, 104 seq.
Didrachma, 143.
Digamma, 166.
Dionysius Carthusianus, 177.
Drachma, 143.
*δῆμος*, *λαός*, 79.
*δηνάριον*, 142 seq.
*διά*, distinguished from *ὑπό*, 107 seq.; its connection with Inspiration, 109 seq.; with the doctrine of the Word, 110 seq.; misrendered with the accusative, 111 seq., 119 seq.
*διάβολος*, *δαιμόνιον*, 78 seq.
*διαμερίζεσθαι*, 123.
*δικαίωμα*, 120.
*δόσις*, *δώρημα*, 77 seq.
*δοῦλοι*, *διάκονοι*, 73.

E.

Easter, 139.
Egyptian Service-books, 173–4.
Egyptian Versions, rendering of *παράκλητος*, 62; of *σπιλάδες*, 120; of *ἐπιούσιος*, 173 seq., 179.
Elias, Elijah, 131, 133.
Ellicott (Bishop) on Revision, 35, 58, 88.
English language, present knowledge of the, 158 seq.
Ephesians, Epistle to the, its destination and genuineness, 38.
Ephrem Syrus, 173.
Evangelists, parallel passages in the, 45, 56 seq., 101, 103 seq., 125, 138.
*εἶναι*, *γίνεσθαι*, 76 seq.
*εἰς* wrongly translated, 112 seq.
*Ἕλλην*, *Ἑλληνιστής*, 135.
*ἐν* wrongly translated, 113.
*ἐξαίρετος*, 182, 183.
*ἐπερώτημα*, 120.
*ἐπὶ* wrongly translated, 112; the *ι* elided in composition, 166.
*ἐπιγινώσκειν*, *ἐπίγνωσις*, 66 seq.
*ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι*, 123.
*ἐπιοῦσα*, 165, 166.
*ἐπιούσιος*, 163 seq.
*ἐπουσιώδης*, 166, 167.
*ἐριθεία*, 120.

F.

Five Clergymen, Revision of the, 58, 88 seq.
Fulke's answer to Martin, 130 seq.

G.

Gehenna, Hades, 78–9.
Gender, change of, disregarded, 72.
Geneva Bible, Testament. See *Bible*.

Gothic Version of ἐπιούσιος, 180.
Greek, Grecian, Greece, Grecia, 135.
Greek forms of Hebrew names, 133 seq.
Greek scholarship in England, 158 seq.
Gregory the Great on the Latin Versions, 28.
Gregory Nyssen on ἐπιούσιος, 169.
Grote (Professor), 155.
Gutturals (Hebrew), how dealt with in Greek, 133.
γινώσκειν, 65, 66.
γραμματεύς, 140.

H.

Hare (Archdeacon), 58.
Hebrews, Gospel of the, its origin and value, 171 seq.; rendering of ἐπιούσιος, 171.
Heloise, 177.
Hendiadys, 115.
Hilary (St.) on ἐπιούσιος, 178.
Hypallage, 114 seq.

I.

Idols of the cave, market-place, 88 seq.
Imperfect tense mistranslated, 90 seq.
Isidore of Seville, 30.
Ismenias, 28.
ἱερόν, ναός, 79.
ἱεροσυλεῖν, 126.
ἱστάναι, 123.

J.

Jacob of Sarug, 173 seq.
James, Jacob, 136.
Jeremy, Jeremias, 135.
Jerome (St.) revises the Latin Bible, 23; his detractors and opponents, 24 seq., 32; version of the Book of Jonah, 25; corrects the text, 25 seq., 33, 39; does not translate, but revise, 26; his Jewish teachers, 26; his devotion to the work, 27 seq.; gradual reception of his version, 28 seq., 34; his rendering of παράκλετος, 61; of ἐπιούσιος, 176 seq.; of περιούσιος, 176, 181 seq., 182 seq.
Jerusalem, spelling of, 134.
Jesus, Joshua, 136.
Jewry, 138.
Johanan, John, etc., 136 seq.
John, the father of St. Peter, 137.
John (St.), disciples of, 42.
John (St.), Gospel of: its genuineness, 38; minute traits in, 74, 100; coincidences with the Revelation, 54, 62 seq.; with the First Epistle, 54, 58 seq., 62; later than the other Gospels, 87.
John (St.), Apocalypse of: broken syntax of, 117 seq. See *John (St.), Gospel of.*
Jona, two distinct names, 137.
Jude, Juda, Judah, Judas, 137.
Juvencus, 174.

L.

Laodiceans, Epistle to the, 37, 38.
Latin, Old, false readings in, 24 seq.; retained in Service-books, 31; rendering of παράκλητος, 61; of σπιλάδες, 120; of ἐπιούσιος, 174 seq.; of περιούσιος, 184; various reading in the Lord's Prayer, 177.
Latin Vulgate. See *Jerome (St.).*
Latinisms, 145 seq., 152, 159 seq.
Lindisfarne Gospels, 179.
Lord's Prayer, the early use of, 163. See also Appendix (*passim*).
Lucas, Luke, 135.
Luke (St.), Gospel of, two editions of, 43 seq.; its classical language, 102, 143.
Luther's Bible, 41, 179.
λύχνος, φῶς, 106 seq.

M.

Magdalene, spelling and pronunciation of, 135.
Maldonatus, 179.
Marcus, Mark, 135.
Mark (St.), Gospel of, the conclusion of the, 42.
Marsh (Mr.) on revision, etc., 88 seq., 158, 160, 161.
Martin's (Gregory) attack on English Bibles, 130 seq.
Mary, Miriam, 136.
Matthew (St.), Gospel of, peculiarities of language in, 86 seq., 103; its relation to the Gospel of the Hebrews, 171.
Measure, in what sense used, 143, 144.
Metaphors obscured, 124 seq.
Milman (Dean), error of, 177.
Modius, 144.
Mount, Sermon on the, its locality, 101 seq.
Münster's Latin Bible, 129.
μέριμνα, μεριμνᾶν, 145 seq., 167; distinguished from μέλειν, 146.
μετάνοια, μεταμέλεια, 76.
μετρητής, 144.
μοιχᾶσθαι, μοιχευθῆναι, 73 seq.
μορφή, σχῆμα, 77 seq.

N.

Nicene Creed, misunderstanding of, 10 seq.
Nicolas of Lyra, 177.
*νήπιοι, παιδία*, 75.
*νόμος, ὁ νόμος*, 93.

O.

Official titles, rendering of, 139 seq.
Origen on *ἐπιούσιος*, 163 seq., 168 seq.; on *περιούσιος*, 180 seq.; his method of interpretation, 168; general adoption of his interpretations, 169.
*ὁδός (ἡ)*, 96 seq.
*οἶδα, γινώσκω, ἐπίσταμαι*, etc., 65 seq.
*ὄνομα (τὸ)*, 98 seq.
*ὀπτάνεσθαι*, 126.
*ὀργή (ἡ)*, 98 seq.
*ὄρος (τὸ)*, 101 seq.
*-ούσιος*, adjectives in, derived from *-ων*, 165, 183; from *οὐσία*, 165.
*οὕτως*, 74.

P.

Papias, 42, 157.
Paronomasia, 64 seq.
Paul (St.), his use of the aorist, 82 seq.; his vision, 86 seq.; his teaching of redemption, 92; his conception of law, 93; his thorn in the flesh, 125.
Peculium, peculiaris, 183 seq.
Peculiar, 183 seq.
Perfect, confused with the aorist, 81; misrendered, 85 seq.
Peshito. See *Syriac Versions.*
Pfeiffer, 175.
Phenice, Phœnix, Phœnicia, 138.
Pleroma, the, 95 seq.
Prepositions, in composition neglected, 71 seq.; variation of, disregarded, 72; mistranslations of, 107 seq.
Present tense, mistranslated, 89 seq.
Plumptre (Professor) on Revision, 35, 159.
Proper names, how to be dealt with, 128 seq.; should conform in the O.T. and N.T., 131 seq.; whether to be translated or reproduced, 138 seq.
*παῖς*, servant, 124.
*παράκλητος*, 58 seq.
*πάρεσις*, 119 seq.
*περιουσιασμός*, 181.
*περιούσιος*, 163, 168, 180 seq.
*περιποίησις*, 181 seq.
*πλοῖον, τὸ πλοῖον*, 103 seq.
*πνεῦμα*, wind, spirit, 63 seq.
*πολλοί, οἱ πολλοί*, etc., 92 seq.
*πρᾶγμα (τὸ)*, 99 seq.
*προβιβάζειν*, 120.
*προφήτης (ὁ)*, 95.
*πυλῶνες*, 126.
*πτερύγιον (τὸ)*, 100.
*πωροῦν, πώρωσις*, 120.
*φαίνειν, φαίνεσθαι*, 115 seq.
*φαίνομαι ὤν, φαίνομαι εἶναι*, 116.
*φθινοπωρινός*, 119.
*φωνή, φθόγγος*, 75.

R.

Rabbi, Rabboni, 139.
Rahab, spelling of, 134.
Redemption, 92.
Revision (the new) of the English Bible, historical parallel to, 31 seq.; gloomy forebodings of, 31; exaggerated views of, 32; antagonism to, 32; disastrous results anticipated from, 33; ultimate acceptance of, 34 seq.; need of, 34 seq. (*passim*); prospects of, 151 seq.; conservative tendencies of rules affecting, 160 seq.; liberal conditions of, 161; favorable circumstances attending, 161 seq.
Roberts (Dr.), 171.
Rome, bishops of, their use of the Latin Versions, 28 seq.
Rufinus, 25.

S.

Salvation, how regarded in the New Testament, 89, 90.
Saron. See *Sharon.*
Second advent, 96 seq.
Shamefaced, shamefast, 156.
Sharon, the, 100 seq., 133.
Shechinah, *σκηνή*, 63 seq.
Shibboleth, 133.
Sower, parable of the, 56–7.
Stanley (Dean), 101 seq.
Stater, 143.
Substantia, 174.
Suicer, 168.
Supersubstantialis, 169, 175, 176 seq., 177.
Symmachus, 183.
Synonyms, 65, 73 seq.
Syrian Service-books, 173.
Syrian Versions:
Curetonian, rendering of *παράκλητος*, 61; of *ἐπιούσιος*, 171, 173 (bis), 180.
Jerusalem, rendering of *ἐπιούσιος*, 172.
Peshito, rendering of *παράκλητος*, 61; of *Καναναῖος* and *Χαναναῖος*, 122; of *ἐπιούσιος*, 172, 173, 179.

Philoxenian (Harclean) rendering of *σπιλάδες*, 120; of *ἐπιούσιος*, 172 seq.
*σάββατα*, 127.
*σάτον*, 144.
*σεβόμενοι*, 126.
*σκηνή, σκηνοῦν*, 63 seq.
*σπεκουλάτωρ*, 141.
*σπῖλοι, σπιλάδες*, 120.
*στερέωμα*, 125 seq.
*συλαγωγεῖν*, 120.
*σωζόμενοι* (*οἱ*), 89 seq.
סגלה, 181 seq.

T.

Talent, 144.
Tenses wrongly rendered, 80 seq.
Tertullian, 174.
Text, importance of a correct, 39 seq.
Textual criticism, its tendencies, 36 seq.
Teutonic Versions of the Lord's Prayer, 179.
Theodoret on *ἐπιούσιος*, 170.
Theophylact on *ἐπιούσιος*, 171 seq.
Tholuck, 164, 168.
Thomas, Acts of, 173.
Trench (Archbishop) on the Authorized Version, 35, 52, 58, 74, 84, 119, 122, 124, 131, 146, 148, 159.
Trent, Council of, 33, 179.
Tyndale's Bible. See *Bible*.
*θεῖον* (*τὸ*), 126.
*θέλημα*, 98 seq.
*θριαμβεύειν*, 119.

U.

Urbane, 135.
*ὕλη*, 123.
*ὑπό, διά*, 107 seq.

V.

Various readings, 41 seq.
Victorinus on *ἐπιούσιος*, 174; on *περιούσιος*, 181.
Vulgate. See *Jerome* (*St.*).

W.

Wages of laborers, 142 seq.
Way, the, 96 seq.
Westcott (Dr.), 30 seq., 103.
Wicliffe's Bible. See *Bible*.
Witnesses, the three heavenly, 40 seq.
Wrath, the, 98 seq.
Wright (Professor), 172, 173 (bis).

Z.

Zurich Latin Bible, 41, 179.
*ζῷα, θηρία*, 73.

THE END.

ON THE

# AUTHORIZED VERSION

OF THE

# NEW TESTAMENT

IN CONNECTION

WITH SOME RECENT PROPOSALS FOR ITS REVISION.

BY

RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D.,

ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

NEW YORK:

HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS,

FRANKLIN SQUARE.

1873.

# CONTENTS.


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Introductory Remarks | 5 |
| II. | On the necessary Inferiority of Translations to their Originals | 13 |
| III. | On the English of the Authorized Version | 31 |
| IV. | On some Questions of Translation, and the Answers to them which our Translators gave | 61 |
| V. | On some unnecessary Distinctions introduced | 74 |
| VI. | On some real Distinctions effaced | 90 |
| VII. | On some better Renderings forsaken, or placed in the Margin | 99 |
| VIII. | On some Errors of Greek Grammar | 115 |
| IX. | On some questionable Renderings of Words | 134 |
| X. | On some incorrect Renderings of Words and Passages | 147 |
| XI. | On some Charges unjustly brought against the Authorized Version | 163 |
| XII. | On the best Means of carrying out a Revision | 175 |
| Appendix | | 187 |
| Indices | | 191 |
| I. | Principal Texts considered | 191 |
| II. | Greek Words | 193 |
| III. | Other Words | 194 |

# ON THE AUTHORIZED VERSION

OF THE

# NEW TESTAMENT.

## CHAPTER I.

### INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

It is clear that the question, Are we, or are we not, to have a new translation of Scripture? or rather—since few would propose this who did not wish to lift anchor and loosen from its moorings the whole religious life of the English people—Shall we, or shall we not, have a new revision of the Authorized Version? is one which is presenting itself more and more familiarly to the minds of men. This, indeed, is not by any means the first time that this question has been earnestly discussed; but that which distinguishes the present agitation of the matter from preceding ones is, that on all former occasions the subject was only debated among scholars and divines, and awoke no interest in circles beyond them. The present is apparently the first occasion on which it has taken serious hold of the popular mind. But now indications of the interest which it is awakening reach us from every side. America is sending us the instalments—it must be owned not very encouraging ones—of a new version as fast as she can.* The wish for a revision has for a considerable time

* With more haste, it is to be feared, than good speed. It is certainly not very encouraging, in respect of the equipment of those who undertake the work, when in the American Bible Union's version of the Epistle to the Hebrews, published with an enormous apparatus of what present themselves as

been working among Dissenters here; by the voice of one of these it has lately made itself heard in Parliament, and by the mouth of a Margaret Professor of Divinity in Convocation. Our Reviews, and not those only which are specially dedicated to religious subjects, begin to deal with the question of revision. There are, or a little while since there were, frequent letters in the newspapers, either urging such a step, or remonstrating against it; few of them, it is true, of much value or weight, yet, at the same time, showing how many minds are now occupied with the subject.

It is manifestly a question of such immense importance, the issues depending on a right solution of it are so vast and solemn, that it may well claim a temperate and wise discussion. Nothing is gained, on the one hand, by vague and general charges of inaccuracy brought against our version; they require to be supported by detailed proofs. Nothing, on the other hand, is gained by charges and insinuations against those who urge a revision, as though they desired to undermine the foundations of the religious life and faith of England; were Socinians in disguise, or Papists—Socinians who hoped that, in another translation, the witness to the divinity

learned notes, we fall, in the fifth page, upon this note [on i., 9, "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity"]: "*ἠγάπησας . . . . καὶ ἐμίσησας*. These *participles* are usually rendered by verbs." The translator congratulates himself that the *errata* are few. Running over a few of the notes I detected these: *ἐστεφάνωσας*, p. 9; *ὁμοιότετα*, p. 21; *βοήθιαν*, do.; *πονεράς*, pp. 14, 53; *φοτισθέντες*, p. 55; *καταπόθηαν*, p. 64; *σπουδάσομεν* (Heb. iv., 11), p. 19; *πλανομένοις*, p. 21; *σωτερίας*, p. 27; *ἀντιλοχίας*, p. 32; *ἀκούμενοι*, p. 73; *διαθήκεν*, p. 46; *μεμαρτύρεται*, p. 58; *ἐρμενευόμενος*, p. 30; *εὐλόγεκε*, p. 31; *κατάπαυσε*, p. 19; *κατάσχομεν*, p. 15—all these, except perhaps one or two, testifying for themselves that they are not mere printer's *errata*; such I have omitted. The Ephesians yields a similar harvest: as *χαιρῶν*, *χαιροῦ*, p. 4; *ἐκληρώθεμεν*, ib.; *εὐαγγαλίζω*, p. 5; *ἐνεργία*, p. 6; *μυστερίου*, p. 3; Epiphanias, p. 4; *συνεζωποίεσε*, p. 7; *ἐζοποίεσε*, bis, p. 8; *πρετοίμασεν*, p. 9; *πορόω*, p. 19; *ἐνέργησε*, p. 6.

[In justice to the Bible Union, I beg leave to add that the work referred to belongs to its early publications, and that this society should be judged rather by the New Testament which has since been completed, and by the scholarly works of Dr. Conant on Job, Genesis, Psalms, and Proverbs, prepared for, and published by the Bible Union.—P. S.]

of the Son and of the Spirit might prove less clear than in the present—Papists who desired that the authority of the English Scripture, the only Scripture accessible to the great body of the people, might be so shaken and rendered so doubtful, that men would be driven to their Church, and to its authority, as the only authority that remained. As little is the matter profited, or in any way brought nearer to a settlement, by sentimental appeals to the fact that this, which it is now proposed to alter, has been the Scripture of our childhood, in which we and so many generations before us first received the tidings of everlasting life. All this, well as it may deserve to be considered, yet, as argument at all deciding the question, will sooner or later have to be cleared away; and the facts of the case, apart from cries, and insinuations, and suggestions of evil motives, and appeals to the religious passions and prejudices of the day—apart, too, from feelings which in themselves demand the highest respect, will have to be dealt with in that spirit of seriousness and earnestness which a question affecting so profoundly the whole moral and spiritual life of the English people, not to speak of nations which are yet unborn, abundantly deserves.

It is no main and leading purpose in the pages which follow either to advocate a revision or to dissuade one; but rather I have proposed to myself to consider the actual worth of our present translation; its strength, and also any weaknesses which may affect that strength; its beauty, and also the blemishes which impair that beauty in part; the grounds on which a new revision of it may be demanded; the inconveniences, difficulties, the dangers it may be, which would attend such a revision; some of the rules and principles according to which it would need, if undertaken at all, to be carried out; and thus, so far as this lies in my power, to assist others, who may not have been able to give special attention to this subject, to form a decision for themselves. I will not, in so doing, pretend that my own mind is entirely in equilibrium on the subject. On the whole, I am persuaded that a re-

vision ought to come; I am convinced that it will come. Not, however, let us trust, as yet; for we are not as yet in any respect prepared for it; the Greek (I mean that special Hellenistic Greek here required), this, and the English no less, which would be needful to bring this work to a successful end, might, it is to be feared, be wanting alike. There is much of crude and immature in nearly all the contributions which have been, and for some time yet will be made, to this object. Nor, certainly, do I underrate the other difficulties which would beset such an enterprise; they look, some of them, the more serious to me the more I contemplate them. Still, believing that this mountain of difficulty will have to be surmounted, I can only trust and confidently hope that it, like so many other mountains, will not, on nearer approach, prove so formidable as at a distance it appears. Only let the Church, when the due time shall arrive, address herself to this work with earnest prayer for the divine guidance, her conscience bearing her witness that in no spirit of idle innovation, that only out of dear love to her Lord and his truth, and out of an allegiance to that truth which overbears every other consideration, with an earnest longing to present his Word, whereof she is the guardian, in all its sincerity, to her children, she has undertaken this hard and most perilous task, and in some way or other every difficulty will be overcome. Whatever pains and anxieties the work may cost her, she will feel herself abundantly rewarded if only she is able to offer God's Word to her children, not indeed free from all marks of human infirmity clinging to its outward form—for we shall have God's treasure in earthen vessels still—but with some of these blemishes which she now knows of removed, and altogether approaching nearer to that which she desires to see it, namely, a work without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing—a perfect copy of an archetype that is perfect.

In the mean time, while the matter is still in suspense and debate, while it occupies, as it needs must, the anxious thoughts of many, it can not misbecome those who have been

specially led by their duties or their inclinations to a more close comparison of the English Version with the original Greek, to offer whatever they have to offer, be that little or much, for the helping of others toward a just and dispassionate judgment, and one founded upon evidence, in regard to the question at issue. And if they consider that a revision ought to come, or, whether desirable or not, that it will come, they must wish to throw in any contribution which they have to make toward the better accomplishing of this object. Assuming that they have any right to mingle in the controversy at all, they may reasonably hope that, even if much which they bring has long ago been brought forward by others, or must be set aside from one cause or another, yet that something will remain, and will survive that rigorous proof to which every suggestion of change should be submitted. And in a matter of such high concernment as this the least is much. To have cast in even a mite into this treasury of the Lord, to have brought one smallest stone which it is permitted to build into the walls of his house, to have detected one smallest blemish that would not otherwise have been removed, to have made in any way whatever a single suggestion of lasting value toward the end here in view, is something for which to be forever thankful. It is in that intention, with this hope, that I have ventured to publish these pages.

The work, indeed, which I thus undertake, can not be regarded as a welcome one. There is often a sense of something ungenerous, if not actually unjust, in passing over large portions of our Version, where all is clear, correct, lucid, happy, awakening continual admiration by the rhythmic beauty of the periods, the instinctive art with which the style rises and falls with its subject, the skillful surmounting of difficulties the most real, the diligence and success with which almost all which was best in preceding translations has been in it retained and embodied; the constant solemnity and seriousness which, by some nameless skill, is made to rest upon

all; in passing over all this and much more with a few general words of recognition, and then stopping short and urging some single blemish or inconsistency, and dwelling upon and seeming to make much of this, which often in itself is so little; for the flaws pointed out are frequently so small and so slight that it might almost seem as if the objector had armed his eye with a microscope for the purpose of detecting that which otherwise would have escaped notice, and which, even if it were faulty, might well have been suffered to pass by, unchallenged and lost sight of, in the general beauty of the whole. The work of Momus is never, or at least never ought to be, other than an ungracious one. Still less do we welcome the office of fault-finder when that whose occasional petty flaws we are pointing out has claims of special gratitude, and reverence, and affection from us. It seems at once an unthankfulness and almost an impiety to dwell on errors in that to which we for ourselves owe so much; to which the whole religious life of our native land owes so much; which has been the nurse and fosterer of our national piety for hundreds of years; which, associated with so much that is sad and joyful, sweet and solemn, in the heart of every one, appeals as much to our affections as to our reason.

But, admitting all this, we may still reconcile ourselves to this task by such considerations as the following; and, first, that a passing by of the very much which is excellent, with a dwelling on the very little which is otherwise, lies in the necessity of the task undertaken. What is good, what is perfect, may have, and ought to have, its goodness freely and thankfully acknowledged; but it offers comparatively little matter for observation. It is easy to exhaust the language of admiration, even when that admiration is intelligently and thoughtfully rendered. We are not tempted to pause till we meet with something which challenges dissent, nor can we avoid being mainly occupied with this.

And then, secondly, if it be urged that many of the objections made are small and trivial, it can only be replied that

nothing is really small or trivial which has to do with the Word of God, which helps or hinders the exactest setting forth of that Word. That Word lends an importance and a dignity to every thing connected with it. The more deeply we are persuaded of the inspiration of Holy Scripture, and of the extent of this inspiration, the more intolerant we shall be of any lets and hinderances to the arriving at a perfect understanding of that which the mouth of God has spoken. In setting forth his Word in another language from that in which it was first uttered, we may justly desire such an approximation to perfection as the instrument of language—to which so much of imperfection cleaves—will allow; and this not merely in greatest things, but in smallest.

Nor yet need the occasional shortcomings of our translators be noted in any spirit of disrespect to them, or disparagement of their work. Some of the errors into which they fell were inevitable, and belonged in no proper sense to them more than to the whole age in which they lived, as, for instance, in the matter of the Greek article. Unless we were to demand a miracle, and that their scholarship should have been altogether on a different level from that of their age, this could not have been otherwise. We may reasonably require of such a company of men, undertaking so great and solemn a work, that their knowledge should approve itself on a level with the very best which their age could supply; even as it does; but more than this it would be unfair and absurd to demand. If other of their mistakes might have been avoided, as is plain from the fact that predecessors or contemporaries did avoid them, and yet were not avoided by them, this only shows that the marks of human weakness and infirmity, which cleave to every work of men, cleave also to theirs. Nor will I refrain from adding, to preoccupy that charge of presumption, which is so ready at hand to cast in the face of any one who objects to any part of their work, that he who ventures to do this does not in this presumptuously affirm himself a better scholar than they were. He for the most part only draws on the accumulated stores of

the knowledge of Greek, which have been laboriously got together in the two hundred and fifty years that have elapsed since their work was done; he only claims to be an inheritor in some sort of the cares specially devoted to the elucidation of the meaning of Holy Scripture during this period. It would be little to the honor of those ages if they had made no advances in this knowledge; it would be little to the honor of our own if we did not profit by their acquisitions. What our translators said on this point concerning those who went before them, we, or those who come after us, may in turn say of them; and I can not do better than quote here the very words in which they disclaimed for their work that it implied any disparagement of those upon whose labors they rather were entering with praise to God, and with thankful gratitude to them: "We are so far off from condemning any of their labors that travailed before us in this kind, . . . that we acknowledge them to have been raised up of God for the building and furnishing of his Church, and that they deserve to be had of us and of posterity in everlasting remembrance. . . . Blessed be they, and most honored be their name, that break the ice, and give the onset upon that which helpeth forward to the saving of souls. . . . . Yet for all that, as nothing is begun and perfected at the same time, and the later thoughts are thought to be the wiser; so if we, building upon their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labors, do endeavor to make that better which they left so good, no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike us; they, we persuade ourselves, if they were alive, would thank us. . . . . Of one and the same book of Aristotle's *Ethics* there are extant not so few as six or seven several translations. Now, if this cost may be bestowed upon the gourd, which affordeth us a little shade, and which to-day flourisheth, but to-morrow is cut down, what may we bestow —nay, what ought we not to bestow upon the Vine, the fruit whereof maketh glad the conscience of man, and the stem whereof abideth forever? And this is the Word of God, which we translate."

## CHAPTER II.

### ON THE NECESSARY INFERIORITY OF TRANSLATIONS TO THEIR ORIGINALS.

It is good and necessary that all who seek accurately to measure in a translation what it yields and what it fails in yielding, should present clearly and distinctly to their own minds the fact that in all translations there are losses unavoidable, as well as losses avoidable; that if, in emptying the precious wine from one vessel to another, a careless hand may cause sometimes that to be spilt which might have been preserved, there is a further spilth which not the utmost care and skill could have prevented altogether. Avoidable losses, as has just been implied, are those which more pains, more watchfulness, a more complete mastery of the language out of which the translation is made, a more complete mastery of that into which it is made, enabling to call forth all its latent capacities, and, I will add, more genius, would have hindered from occurring; and it is for these alone that any translators can be held responsible. Unavoidable are those inherent in the nature of the task; in the relations of one language to another; in the lack of accurate correlations and correspondencies between them; in the very different schemes on which they are constructed; in what one might venture to call the innate stubbornness of the ὕλη out of which a new cosmos, the rival of that already existing, has to be evoked; the inferiority, if not throughout, yet in special points, of the translators' language—losses, therefore, which no labor, no skill, no genius, no mastery of one language or the other, no employment of all helps within reach, would have prevented. The translators may have done their part to the full; may have *turned*, and not *overturned*, their original (Jerome com-

plains that in his time many *versiones* deserved to be called *eversiones* rather); they may have given the lie to the Italian proverb, "*Traduttori traditori*," or "Translators traitors" —men, that is, who do not *render*, but *surrender*, their author's meaning—their shortcomings may in weight and number be as few as it is possible to conceive, nay, let them be none at all, and yet the losses of which I speak will not have been therefore excluded.

It is not possible always to draw the exact line between these losses and the others. Thus a passage may have baffled the skill of one and of another adequately to give it back in a second tongue; it may seem as though the thing were not to be done; when another may arise, who, a greater master of language, or in a more genial hour, may untie or cut the knot which has baffled the skill of all who went before him, may take the impregnable fortress before which so many others have sat down in vain. It is to such translators, most few in number, that the magnificent encomium which Jerome gives to Hilary and his renderings from the Greek belongs —"quasi captivos sensus in suam linguam victoris jure transposuit" (*Ep.* 33). We can seldom, therefore, absolutely affirm of any particular passage that its difficulties can never be completely overcome, though of many that they have never yet been overcome. Yet this must not prevent us from recognizing a large number of the shortcomings which attend all translation as ranging under this category—to be regretted, therefore, but not to be imputed; seeing that, if any fault is to be found, it must be found with language itself, which, marvelous gift of God as it is, yet working through men's limited faculties and powers, proves often so imperfect an implement; which, capable of so much, is yet not capable of all.

It needs hardly be observed that, in thus speaking of the mountains which will not become plains, I assume throughout that the work to be rendered *has* mountains; that it is grand in features, original in design; that the genius of its

author travels more or less by unwonted paths, moves in an unwonted sphere, advances to the limits of human thought, and thus stretches to the utmost the capabilities of human speech. No one will deny that where thought, feeling, passion, imagination are absent, or are only slightly present, it will be quite possible to render from one language to another with little or no loss in the transfer; but the *Agamemnon*, the *Divina Commedia*, or the *Faust*—what translator (unless he has entered upon his task with that utter unfitness for it which prevents him even from comprehending the greatness and the difficulties of it) has not been staggered and amazed at the vastness, the variety, the infinite perplexity of the problems which are in these offered for his solution—problems of which some will have to be evaded rather than solved, some to be solved imperfectly, and some not to be solved at all?

And if this be so with works of man's art and device, how much more certainly and how much more signally must it be the case where the book that is to be rendered is sole and unparalleled of its kind, reaching to far higher heights and far deeper depths than any other; having words of God, and not of man, for its substance; where the garments of man's speech *must* be narrower than the body of God's truth, which yet by one means or another has to be clothed with it; while the importance of doing the best possible with the far-reaching issues which will follow on success or failure falls in each other case into absolute insignificance as compared with its importance here.

This imperfection, it may be replied, is an imperfection cleaving to all human languages alike; the original language must suffer from it no less than that into which the version is to be made. It can not be doubted that this, to a certain point, is true. No doubt, in whatever human tongue God may please to make his will to be known, his thoughts will transcend our speech. Wherever the sons of heaven are married to the daughters of earth—divine thoughts to human

words—the inequality of the union, the fact that, whatever richest blessings it may bring with it, it is still a marriage of disparagement, will make itself plainly to appear. We shall have his treasure, if I may repeat the image, in earthen vessels still. At the same time, one vessel may be of far finer, another of far coarser earth. Thus, where a language for long centuries has been the organ and vehicle of divine truth, there will be in it words which will have grown and expanded into some meetness for the task to which they have been put. Long set apart for sacred uses, for the designation of holy persons or things, there will float a certain sanctity round them. Life and death, good and evil, sin and repentance, heaven and hell, with all the mysteries of each, will have found utterances not wholly inadequate to them.

But how different will it be in a language now for the first time brought into the service of divine truth. Here all will be by comparison slight and superficial, common and profane. For the most solemn, the most sacred, the augustest mysteries of our redemption, words will have to be employed which have little, if any thing, of solemn, or sacred, or august about them—words which have sometimes almost to be picked out of the mire,* in the hope that they might be cleansed, may little by little be filled with a higher sense, a holier

* How often the missionary translator must make the experience which the Jesuits made in Japan long ago. One who has written the wonderful history of their labors there speaks thus: "Though the language be so copious, still it wants several proper words for expressing the mysteries of our religion, which makes the preachers of the Gospel very uneasy; for to use a word with an equivocal sense either turns the discourse into ridicule, or at least makes it unintelligible. As, for example, the word *jumogi*, a cross, signifies also a letter of the alphabet and the number ten; and therefore a preacher who makes use of this word to denote the cross of Christ our Lord, leaves his auditory at a loss for his meaning. In like manner, if he would speak of a soul, they'll conclude he means the devil, the same word and character being common to both. To avoid, then, all equivocations, and give the infidels a more lively idea and higher veneration for our sacred mysteries, the fathers of the society thought fit to make use of the Portuguese words; and so they call God *Dios*, the soul *alma*, the cross *cruz*, the devil *demonio*."—*History of the Church of Japan, written originally in French by Monsieur l'Abbé de T.* London, 1705; vol. i., p. 7; comp. p. 73.

meaning, than any which before their adoption into this sacred service they knew. And so no doubt they will at last; heathen "Ostara" will become Christian "Easter;" "suona," and "sunta," and "sculd," words touching once but the outer circumference of life in the old German heathendom, will severally, as "Sühne," and "Sünde," and "Schuld," touch the centre and core of the Christian life of men. "Hriuwa," which meant so little, will become "Reue," which means so much; "galauba," "Glaube;" not to speak of innumerable other words, to which the same or a yet more wonderful transfiguration will arrive.

We have examples new and old of the extreme perplexity, of which this which I have just mentioned will continually be the cause. Thus the missionary translator, if he be at all aware of the awful implement which he is wielding, of the tremendous crisis in a people's spiritual life which has arrived when their language is first made the vehicle of revealed truths, will often tremble at the work he has in hand—tremble lest he should be permanently lowering or confusing the whole religious life of a people by choosing a meaner and letting go a nobler word for the setting forth of some leading truth of redemption; and yet the choice how difficult, the nobler itself falling how infinitely below his desires, and below the truth of which he would make it the bearer. Even those who are wholly ignorant of Chinese can yet perceive how vast the spiritual interests which are at stake in China; how much will be won or how much lost for the whole spiritual life of that people, it may be for ages to come, according as the right or the wrong word is selected by the translators of the Scriptures into Chinese for expressing the true and the living God.* As many of us as are ignorant of the language can be no judges in the controversy which on this matter is being carried on; but we can all feel how vital the question, how enormous the interests which are at stake; and not less, having heard the allegations on the one side and on

* See the Rev. S. C. Malan's *Who is God in China, Shin or Shang-te?*

the other, that there is only an alternative of difficulties here.

And even where the issues are not so vast and awful as in this case, how much may turn on having, or not having, the appropriate word. Two, or it may be more, will present themselves, each inadequate, yet each with its own advantages, so that it shall be exceedingly difficult for the most skillful master of language to determine which ought to be preferred. Thus it was not indifferent whether Λόγος in the prologue of St. John's Gospel, and in the other passages which would naturally be ruled by that passage, should be rendered in ecclesiastical Latin "sermo" or "verbum." The fact that "verbum" has from the beginning been the predominant rendering, and that "verbum" is a neuter impersonal, possessing no such mysterious duplicity of meaning as Λόγος, which is at once "the Word" and "the Reason," has, I do not hesitate to affirm, modified the whole development of Latin theology in respect of the personal "Word of God." I do not, indeed, believe that the advantages which in "verbum" are foregone, would have been secured by the choosing of "sermo" rather; any gains from this would have been accompanied by more than countervailing losses. I can not, therefore, doubt that the Latin Church did wisely and well in preferring "verbum" to "sermo;" indeed, it ultimately quite disallowed the latter; but still the doubts and hesitation which existed for some time upon this point* illustrate well the difficulty of which I am speaking.

Or take another question, not altogether unlike this. Did the old "pœnitentia," or the "resipiscentia" which some of the Reformers sought to introduce in its room, best represent μετάνοια? should μετανοεῖτε be rendered "pœnitentiam agite" or "resipiscite?"† The Roman Catholics found great fault with Beza, that, instead of the "pœnitentia," hallowed by

* See Petavius, *De Trin.*, vi., 1, 4.

† See Fred. Spanheim's *Dub. Evangelica*, pars 3ª, dub. vii.; Campbell *On the Four Gospels*, vol. i., p. 292 *sqq.*

long ecclesiastical usage, and having acquired a certain prescriptive right by its long employment in the Vulgate, he, in his translation of Scripture, substituted "resipiscentia." Now Beza, and those who stood with him in this controversy, were assuredly right in replying that, while a serious displeasure on the sinner's part at his past life is an important element in all true μετάνοια or repentance, still "pœnitentia" is at fault, in that it brings out nothing but this, leaves the changed mind for the time to come, which is the central idea of the original word,* altogether unexpressed and untouched; that, moreover, "resipiscentia" was no such novelty, Lactantius having already shown the way in a rendering with which now so much fault was found. Taking his ground strictly on etymology, Beza was perfectly justified; but it was also true, which he did not take account of, that μετάνοια, even before it had been assumed into scriptural usage,† and much more after, had acquired a superadded sense of regret for the past, or "hadiwist" (had-I-wist), as our ancestors called it; which, if "pœnitentia" seemed to embody too exclusively, his "resipiscentia," making at least as serious an omission, hardly embodied at all.‡ On the whole, I can not but think that it would have been better to leave "pœnitentia" undisturbed, while yet how much on either side there was here to be urged.

This, however, only by the way. The painful perplexity alluded to above, and felt so deeply by many a missionary translator at the present day, did not touch ours. Thanks to Gregory the Great, to the monk Augustine, to Alfred, to Wicliffe, to Tyndale, and so many more, English was a lan-

* Tertullian had noted this long before (*Adv. Marc.*, ii., 24): "In Græco sermone pœnitentiæ nomen non ex delicti confessione, sed *ex animi demutatione* compositum est."

† Plutarch (*Pericles*, c. 10): *Μετάνοια ἔσχε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους καὶ πόθος ἔσχε τοῦ* Κιμῶνος.

‡ A very recent translator of the New Testament in America seeks to make good for the English what Beza would have made good for the Latin; and for "Repent" every where substitutes "Change your minds," and for "repentance," "change of mind!"

guage in which the wonderful works of God had been proclaimed so long, the language and the faith had so grown together, that those who in the latter days undertook this task of translating the Scriptures into English had not to complain of any strangeness in the one to the truths of the other, or of any profane, much less degrading, associations clinging to the words which they were obliged to use. Still the transcendent character of the Book to be rendered, being the Book of Him whose thoughts are not as our thoughts, must not be left out of sight when we seek to take a measure of what we may call the insuperable difficulties which attended the work they undertook.

But, setting aside this the unique character of the Bible, there are reasons enough why the translation of any considerable book must always in many points halt behind the original. These reasons are plain. In every language of highly-cultivated men — probably, indeed, more than all in those two which God has willed shall contain the authentic records of his revelation of himself to mankind—there will be found subtleties, felicities, audacities, and other excellencies of speech, which are not capable of reproduction in any other. Each will have *idioms* in the strictest sense of the word —turns of speech, that is, proper and peculiar to itself; and though other languages may have compensations more or fewer, which in like manner are theirs alone, still these, not being found there where exactly the translator wants them, are not likely to assist him much, or to redress the balance in his favor again.

One people will seize differences and distinctions, and embody them in words, which another has not cared, or, it may be, has not had the skill or the good fortune to make its own. Thus the Greek will often have two words where we have but one. Hannibal is "one-eyed" for us, and a Cyclops or Arimaspian is "one-eyed;" but in the Greek he who is conceived to have by nature but a single eye is μονόφθαλμος; he who has only one, because the other has been lost, is ἑτερόφ-

θαλμος. It is an indication of the Greek in its decline, when it ceased any longer to trouble itself with these fine but most real distinctions, that the Hellenistic has not cared to retain this distinction (see Matt. xviii., 9; Mark ix., 47). The more subtle-thoughted a people are, the finer and more numerous the differences will be which they will thus have apprehended, and to which they will have given permanence in words. For—to remain on our own immediate ground of the New Testament—what, we may ask, can an English translator do to express the distinction, oftentimes very significant, between ἀνήρ and ἄνθρωπος?—the honor which lies often in the first (Acts xiii., 16; xvii., 22), the slight which is intended to be conveyed in the second (Matt. xxvi., 72)? At this point the Latin, with "vir" and "homo," is a match for the Greek, though we are not. In like manner, the differences, almost always instructive, occasionally important, between ἱερόν and ναός, βίος and ζωή, ἄλλος and ἕτερος, νέος and καινός, ἀληθής and ἀληθινός, φιλέω and ἀγαπάω, βόσκω and ποιμαίνω, mostly disappear, and, as it seems to me, there is no help but that they must disappear, in any English translation. Such facts remind us that language, divine gift to man as it is, yet working itself out through human faculties and powers, has cleaving to it a thousand marks of weakness, and infirmity, and limitation.

To take an example of this, the obliteration of distinctions, which is quite unavoidable, or which could only have been avoided at the cost of greater losses in some other direction, and to deal with it somewhat more in detail—the distinction between ᾅδης, the invisible underworld, the receptacle of all departed, and γέεννα, the place of torment, quite disappears in our Version. They are both translated "hell," ᾅδης being so rendered ten times, and γέεννα twelve; the only attempt to give ᾅδης a word of its own being at 1 Cor. xv., 55, where it is translated "grave." The confusion of which this is the occasion is serious; though how it could have been avoided, or how it would be possible now to get rid of it, I do not in the

least perceive. It would not be possible to render ᾅδης, wherever it occurs, by "grave," thus leaving "hell" as the rendering of γέεννα only; for see Matt. xi., 23; xvi., 18, the two first places of its occurrence, where this plainly would not suit. On the other hand, the popular sense links the name of "hell" so closely with the place of torment, that it would not answer to keep "hell" for ᾅδης, and to look out for some other rendering of γέεννα, to say nothing of the difficulty or impossibility of finding one; for certainly "gehenna," which I have seen proposed, would not do. The French have, indeed, adopted the word, though it is only "gêne" to them; and Milton has once used it in poetry; but it can not, in any sense, be said to be an English word. It is much to be regretted that "hades" has never been thoroughly naturalized among us. The language wants the word, and in it the true solution of the difficulty might have been found.*

Then, too, it will continually happen that one language will have words so elastic, so many-sided, so capable of being employed now in a good sense and now in a bad, in irony or in earnest, that other tongues can produce no equivalents for these. It is quite possible that they also, though transcended in some points, may themselves transcend in others; yet this will not help the translator. "In all languages whatever," to use Bentley's words, "a word of a moral or political signification, containing several complex ideas arbitrarily joined together, has seldom any correspondent word in any other language which extends to all these ideas."† But the remark is capable of far wider application, and we recognize here the source of one necessary imperfection in all translation. Looking at the work from an ideal point of view, it would be manifestly desirable to render constantly one word

* On the "debasing limitation" which Christ's magnificent prerogative, καὶ ἔχω τὰς κλεῖς τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τοῦ ᾅδου (Rev. i., 18), endures, when it is rendered, "and have the keys of death and *of hell*," see some good observations in Howe's grand sermon, "The Redeemer's dominion over the invisible world."—*Works*, London, 1832, pp. 309, 310.

† *On Freethinking*, p. xxx.

in one language by one and the same in another; having given to each its equivalent, to adhere to this throughout. But the rule, however theoretically good, is discovered, when the application of it is attempted, to be one which it is wholly impossible to carry out. If this has ever been proposed as an inflexible law, it must have been on the assumption that words in one language cover exactly the same spaces of meaning which other words do in another; that they have exactly the same many-sidedness, the same elasticity, the same power of being applied for good or for evil, for honor or for shame. But nothing is farther from the case. Words are inclosures from the great outfield of meanings; but different languages have inclosed on different schemes, as chance, or design, or the deeper instincts unconsciously at work in men's minds have determined; and words in different languages which are precisely co-extensive and commensurate with one another, are much rarer than we incuriously assume.

It is easy to illustrate this, the superior elasticity of a word in one language to that of one which is in part its equivalent in another. Thus we have no word in English which at once means heavenly messengers and earthly, with only the context to determine which of the two is intended. There was no choice, therefore, but to render ἄγγελοι by "messengers" at Luke vii., 24; ix., 52; Jam. ii., 25, however it might be translated "angels" in each other passage of the New Testament where it occurs. Again, no word in English has the power which μάγος has in Greek, of being used at will in an honorable sense or a dishonorable. There was no help, therefore, but to render μάγοι by "wise men,"* or some such honorable designation, Matt. ii., 1, and μάγος by "sorcerer," Acts xiii., 6. Thus, again, it would have been difficult to represent Παράκλητος, applied now to the third Person of the Holy

* Milton, indeed, speaks of these wise men as the "star-led *wizards*," and "wizard" is the word which Sir John Cheke employs in his translation of St. Matthew; but the word is scarcely honorable enough for the μάγοι of this place, nor opprobrious enough for the μάγος of the Acts.

Trinity (John xiv., 16, 26), and now to the second (1 John i., 21), by any single word. "Paraclete" would alone have been possible; and such uniformity of rendering, if indeed it could be called rendering at all, would have been dearly purchased by the loss of "Comforter" and "Advocate"—both of them Latin words, it is true, but much nearer to the heart and understanding of Englishmen than the Greek "Paraclete" could ever have become.* To have rendered δαιμόνια "devils," and not "gods," at Acts xvii., 18, because it has been elsewhere so rendered, as Tyndale and Cranmer have done, would have been a confusing mistake. In the mouth of heathen men, such as the Athenians who are speaking here, the word meant something quite different from what it meant elsewhere in the mouth of Jews, and demands to be differently rendered.

So, too, it would have been unadvisable to render κύριε, as the compellation of one person by another, always "Sir," or always "Lord." The word has a wider range than either of these two; it is only the two together which cover an equal extent. "Sir" in many cases would not be respectful enough; "Lord" in some would be too respectful (John xx., 15). Our translators have prudently employed both, and in most cases have shown a fine tact in their selection of one or the other. One's only doubt is whether, in the conversation of our Lord with the Samaritan woman (John iv.), they should not have changed the "Sir," which is perfectly in its place at ver. 11, where she is barely respectful to her unknown interrogator, into "Lord" at ver. 15, or, if not there, yet certainly at ver. 19. The Rheims version beginning, as we do, with "Sir," already has exchanged this for "Lord" at ver. 15, and thus delicately indicates the growing reverence of the woman for the mysterious stranger whom she has met beside Jacob's well.

* We should not forget, in measuring the fitness of "Comforter," that the fundamental idea of "Comforter," according to its etymology and its early use, is that of "Strengthener," and not "Consoler," even as the παράκλητος is one who, being summoned to the side of the accused or imperiled man (*advocatus*), stands by to aid and encourage. See the instructive note in Archdeacon Hare's *Mission of the Comforter*, p. 521–527.

Or, again, a language will have words resting on and embodying some picturesque image, which, so far as they do this, have no counterparts elsewhere. If we met the Spanish "pavonear" or the French "pavaner," we might render these by the English "to strut;" there would, indeed, be hardly any choice but to do so; but where is the peacock (pavon) here? the strutting *as the peacock does*, which underlies and looks through the word which we thus inadequately render? We might render "fourmiller" "to swarm;" we could scarcely do otherwise; but where is the swarming *as the ants do*, the "formiculare," if one might so say, of the French original? So, too, our translators may say, "*Be clothed* with humility" (1 Pet. v., 5); and fitly; for no word in English would express *all* which ἐγκομβώσασθε does in Greek, namely, "Fasten humility upon you as a garment *which is tied with knots*—not, therefore, to be lightly removed from you again." Still there is loss here.

Once more, one language will have words which utter in their own brief compass what it takes two or three, or, it may be, half a dozen words in another language to utter. The New Testament furnishes many such, as the εὐπερίστατος of Heb. xii., 1, not expressible, or, at least, not expressed by us in less than six words, "which doth so easily beset us;" as the ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος of 1 Pet. iv., 15, which costs us only one word less—"busy-body in other men's matters"—to render. I do not venture to affirm that in these particular cases such long circumlocutions were absolutely inevitable. One of the old Latin versions, which renders εὐπερίστατος ἁμαρτία, "*agile* peccatum," has at any rate, so far as the Latin goes, avoided this in the first instance; and then there is "meddler" (though I am not prepared to recommend it), which would have done the same in the second. Still, even if these instances were in one way or another got rid of from our Version, shown to be needless circumlocutions, it would not the less remain certain that any language, rich in expressive words, will frequently offer those which will need two, three,

or, it may be, more, adequately to express in some other, though that other, it may be, elsewhere is as rich, or richer in the same kind. For example, when Montaigne says that women have "l'esprit *primesautier*," that they reach a right conclusion, if they reach it at all, *at the first bound*, what could we do in English with this "primesautier?" and this impossibility of always matching one word by one must be accepted as another necessary imperfection in this work.

One language will give scope and opportunity for pregnant plays upon words, such as St. Paul delights in, for which others afford no answering opportunity; for it is only by a rare good fortune that the *paronomasia* of one language can be represented by that of another. I refer to such as the γινωσκομένη and ἀναγινωσκομένη of 2 Cor. iii., 2; the ἐργαζομένους and περιεργαζομένους of 2 Thess. iii., 11; and probably the ἔμαθε and ἔπαθε (παθήματα, μαθήματα) of Heb. v., 8. The loss, to be sure, on these occasions is not very serious; yet this can not always be said. It can not, for instance, at Ephes. iii., 14, 15: "For this cause I bow my knees unto the *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole *family* in heaven and earth is named." How profound a significance the words of the apostle have, which we only imperfectly reproduce, and this because the word "family" does not stand in etymological relation with "father," as πατριά does with πατήρ; while no other word can be proposed in its stead capable of presenting in English the sublime play on words which exists in the Greek. To God the name "Father" by highest right competes, and "every family" which subsists upon earth subsists as such by right of its relation to him, and witnesses for this in the fact that the word πατριά (here our English breaks down) involves, and, indeed, is only the unfolding of, the word πατήρ. If πατριά were abstract, which some have attempted to prove, but quite failed in so doing, we might venture on "fatherhood" instead of "family," which, indeed, would only be a going back to Wicliffe's translation. He, finding "paternitas" in the Vulgate—I do not know how

this came there, whether from a partial misunderstanding of *πατριά*, or from a praiseworthy determination to reproduce at all costs by aid of "pater" and "paternitas" the Greek *paronomasia* — very fitly rendered it by "fatherhood." *Πατριά*, however, is not thus abstract, but concrete; and being so, help is not here to be found; nor, I believe, any where, except in that living interpretation, that *ministry* of the Word, which should set before it as a constant aim to redress whatever wrongs the readers of the Scripture not in its original tongues may be in danger of suffering.

Again, our translators say, "Now *I know* in part, but then *shall I know* even as also *I am known*" (1 Cor. xiii., 12); and we acquiesce in this, but reluctantly; for who can be quite content here to lose the very remarkable change from the simple *γινώσκω* to the composite and intenser *ἐπιγνώσομαι*, by which the apostle expresses how much deeper, fuller, richer will be the knowledge of the world to come?—we acquiesce in it, because we have no verb connected with "to know" which expresses this higher, more intimate knowledge and insight. "Nosco" and "pernoscam" would do it in the Latin; nothing that I see but "know" and "perfectly know" in the English. Commenting on these words—and it is only by commentary, not by translation, that their force can in English be brought out—one of our divines has well said, "'Επίγνωσις and *γνῶσις* differ. 'Επίγνωσις is *ἡ μετὰ τὴν πρώτην τοῦ πράγματος γνῶσιν παντελὴς κατὰ δύναμιν κατανόησις*. It is bringing me better acquainted with a thing that I knew before, a more exact viewing of an object that I saw before afar off. That little portion of knowledge which we had here shall be much improved; our eye shall be raised to see the same things more strongly and clearly."*

Then, too, what one may call the audacities of a language, new and daring combinations of words, images so bold that no one ventures to reproduce them in another language—such as, keeping clear of, do yet approach so close to the

* Culverwell, *Spiritual Opticks*, p. 180.

verge of extravagance, that tolerable, even sublime, in one language, they would be intolerable, perhaps ridiculous, in another—these will add to the perplexities of a translator. The New Testament does not, indeed, offer any large number of these; but the Old how many. In Æschylus they must well-nigh drive a translator to despair. But even in our version of the New a more vigorous image has been sometimes changed under a real or presumed necessity for a weaker, or, it may be, the imaginative word let go altogether, and replaced by one strictly literal. Thus we have shrunk from "the *lip* of the sea" (Heb. xi., 12), "the *mouths* of the sword" (Heb. xi., 34), and might with still better reason have done so from "the *calves* of the lips" (Hos. xiv., 2). One is, indeed, disposed to think that in this matter we have sometimes run before the need, and let go a strength that might have been perfectly well retained. Thus, why should *σχιζομένους* (Mark i., 10) be "opened," and not rather "rent," which is only suggested in the margin ("cleft" in the Geneva)? Or why should *βασανιζόμενον* (Matt. xiv., 24) be merely "tossed" (a very little sea will "toss" a boat), and not rather "tormented," or some such word? Wicliffe has the vigorous old word "shogged;" De Wette, "geplagt." Compare Mark vi., 48.

Other finer and more delicate turns of language must be suffered to escape. Thus our translators make St. Luke to say that "all the Athenians and strangers spent their time* in nothing else but either to tell or to hear *some new thing*" (Acts xvii., 21); for, indeed, how could they express that exquisite *τι καινότερον* of the sacred historian? not "some *new* thing" only, but "something *newer than the last*"—the *new* so soon growing old and stale that a *newer* was ever needed to tickle their languid and jaded curiosity.†

* Better, I think, "spent their *leisure*" (*εὐκαίρουν*: "vacabant" in the Vulgate); the word implying further that *all* their time was leisure, that "*vacation*," to use Fuller's pun, "was their whole *vocation*."

† Bengel: "*Nova* statim sordebant; *noviora* quærebantur."

And, lastly, it may be observed that what is perfectly clear in one language, through the wealth of inflections and other grammatical helps which it has, will lie open to misapprehension and misunderstanding in another, which has either now renounced, or has never been a possessor of, these. What English reader of 2 Pet. iii., 16, coming to the words "*in which* are some things hard to be understood," does not refer "in which" to the "epistles" of St. Paul, mentioned in the verse preceding, and see in these words a general statement of the hardness and obscurity of those writings? but no reader of the Greek could do this, or help seeing at once that "in which" referred to "these things" immediately going before, the things, namely, which St. Paul had spoken in his epistles concerning the long-suffering God, which *things* the unstable, as St. Peter declares, might easily wrest to their harm. If our Lord declares that the woman who has found her lost piece of silver "calleth her *friends* and her neighbors together" (Luke xv., 9), the Greek says that it is her *female* friends and neighbors; the English says—and, as English now is,* it can say—nothing of the kind. At Luke xviii., 16, one reading in the English might be in doubt to whom the earlier "them" referred, to the "disciples" or "the little children;" no doubt is possible in the Greek. There are, I dare say, some hundreds of such passages in the New Testament.

One word I will add, in conclusion, in regard of such inevitable losses as these, and those others which must also be considered as inevitable, in that, whatever men do, they will do it with a certain imperfection. We may say, looking at the matter from one point of view, that no book suffers so much from the accruing of these as the Bible; while, looking at it from another, none suffers so little. Both which assertions may be illustrated thus: It were a matter of more regret if a grain or two were rubbed off from a solid mass of

* I make this restriction; for if we had preserved "friendess" and "neighbouress," both employed by Wicliffe, though not in this place, our English might have said all which the Greek says.

gold in its transmission from hand to hand (for the loss would be greater), than if the same injury had befallen some lump of meaner ore; while yet, at the same time, no other could at all so well afford this detriment, which would not affect its value in any appreciable degree. It is even so with Holy Scripture. Its preciousness is such that any, the slightest, wrong which may befall it can not but be dearly grudged; every precaution must needs be taken to avert such wrongs, or to reduce them to a *minimum;* while yet the bulk and parcel of truth which is there is so vast, so far exceeding all measures of value which we know, that the very slight harm and loss which may thus come to pass leaves it to all intents and purposes the same treasure, transcending all price, which before it was.

## CHAPTER III.

### ON THE ENGLISH OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION.

THERE is a question, namely, What is the worth of the English in which our translation is composed? which manifestly may be considered apart from another question, How far does this translation adequately represent its original? and there are some advantages in keeping the two considerations separate. The English of our version, which I propose in this way to consider apart, has been very often, and very justly, the subject of highest praise, or, indeed, the occasion of thankful gratulation to the Giver of every good gift, who has given such an excellent gift to us; and if I do not reiterate in words of my own or of others these praises and gratulations, it is only because they have been uttered so often and so fully that it has become a sort of commonplace to repeat them. One fears to encounter the rebuke which befell the rhetorician of old, who, having made a long and elaborate oration in praise of the strength of Hercules, was asked, Who has denied it? at the close. Omitting, then, to praise in general terms what all must praise, it may yet be worth while to ask ourselves in what those singular merits of diction, which by the confession of all it possesses, mainly consist; nor shall I shrink from pointing out what appear to me its occasional weaknesses and blemishes, the spots upon the sun's disk, which impair its perfect beauty.

When, then, we seek to measure the value of any style, there are two points which claim our attention; first, the words themselves; and then, secondly, the words in their relations to one another, and as modified by these relations—in brief, the dictionary and the grammar. These I propose to consider in their order; and, first, the dictionary of our

English Version. Now of this I will not hesitate in expressing my conviction that it is superior to the grammar. The first seems to me nearly as perfect as possible; there are more frequent flaws and faults in the second. In respect of words, we every where recognize in it that true *delectus verborum* on which Cicero* insists so earnestly, and in which so much of the charm of style consists. All the words used are of the noblest stamp, alike removed from vulgarity and pedantry; they are neither too familiar, nor, on the other side, not familiar enough; they never crawl on the ground, as little are they stilted and far-fetched. And then how happily mixed and tempered are the Anglo-Saxon and Latin vocables. No undue preponderance of the latter makes the language remote from the understanding of simple and unlearned men. Thus we do not find in our version, as in the Rheims, whose authors might seem to have put off their loyalty to the English language with their loyalty to the English crown, "odible" (Rom. i., 30), nor "impudicity" (Gal. v., 19), nor "longanimity" (2 Tim. iii., 10), nor "coinquinations" (2 Peter ii., 13, 20), nor "comessations" (Gal. v., 21), nor "postulations" (1 Tim. ii., 1), nor "exinanite" (Phil. ii., 7), nor "contristate" (Eph. iv., 30), nor "zealatours" (Acts xxi., 20), nor "agnition" (Philem. 6), nor "suasible" (Jam. iii., 17), nor "domesticals" (1 Tim. v., 8), nor "repropitiate" (Heb. ii., 17).† Our translators, indeed, set very distinctly before themselves the avoid-

* *De Orat.*, iii., 37.

† Where the word itself which the Rheims translators employ is a perfectly good one, it is yet curious and instructive to observe how often they have drawn on the Latin portion of the language, where we have drawn on the Saxon; thus they use "corporal" where we have "bodily" (1 Tim. iv., 8), "coadjutor" where we have "fellow-worker" (Col. iv., 11; "work-fellow" in the old versions was better still), "incredulity" where we have "unbelief" (Heb. iii., 19, and often), "donary" where we have "gift" (Luke xxi., 5), "superedified" where we have "built up" (1 Pet. ii., 5), "precursor" where we have "forerunner" (Heb. vi., 20), "dominator" where we have "Lord" (Jude 4), "cogitation" where we have "thought" (Luke ix., 46), "fraternity" where we have "brotherhood" (1 Pet. ii., 17); or they have the *more* Latin word where we the *less*, as "obsecrations" where we have "prayers" (Luke v., 33).

ing of "inkhorn" terms. Speaking of their own version, and comparing it with the Rhemish, published some thirty years before, they say, "We have shunned the obscurity of the Papists in the 'Azims,' 'tunicke,' 'rationall,' 'holocausts,' 'prepuce,' 'pasche' [they might have added 'scenopegia,' John vii., 2], and a number of such like, whereof their late translation is full, and that of purpose to darken the sense." It is not a little curious that three of the words thus found fault with, namely, "tunic," "rational," and "holocaust," have become thoroughly naturalized in the language.

And yet, while it is thus with the authors of our Version, there is no extravagant attempt on the other side to put under ban words of Latin or Greek derivation, where there are not, as very often there could not be, sufficient equivalents for them in the homelier portion of our language. Indeed, they now and then employ those Latin where these were close to their hand: witness "celestial" and "terrestrial" (1 Cor. xv., 40), where it was free to them to employ "heavenly" and "earthly;" "omnipotent," of which they make such sublime employment at Rev. xix., 6, where "almighty" would have equally served their turn, and would have been employed if their first thought had been always to find an Anglo-Saxon word. But there is no affectation upon their part of excluding those other, which in their measure and degree have as good a right to admission as the most Saxon vocable of them all; no attempt, like that of Sir John Cheke, who in his version of St. Matthew—in many respects a valuable monument of English—substituted "hundreder" for "centurion," "freshman" for "proselyte," "gainbirth"—*i. e.*, "againbirth" for "regeneration," with much else of the same kind. The fault, it must be owned, was in the right extreme, but was a fault and affectation no less. In regard of the rendering of one very notable word, I mean ἀγάπη, they have gone back, as is well known, in a large number of passages (the most remarkable is 1 Cor. xiii.), from the rendering of the earlier Anglican versions, and for the Saxon "love" substituted the

Latin "charity," and this, which is the more worthy of note, in the face of Tyndale's strong protest against any such rendering.*

One of the most effectual means by which our translators have attained their rare felicity in diction, while it must diminish to a certain extent their claims to absolute originality, enhances in a far higher degree their good sense, moderation, and wisdom; justifies the character which in a certain proud humility they claim to themselves, as "men greater in other men's eyes than in their own, and that sought the truth rather than their own praise." I allude to the extent to which they have availed themselves of the work of those who went before them, and incorporated this work into their own, every where building, if possible, on the old foundations, and displacing nothing for the mere sake of change. On this point we may fitly quote their own words, as best revealing to us the aspect under which they contemplated the work which they had in hand: "Truly, good Christian reader, we never thought from the beginning that we should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one; . . . . but to make a good one a better, or out of many good ones one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against—that hath been our endeavor, that our mark."

It has thus come to pass that our Version, like a costly mosaic, besides having its own felicities, is the inheritor of the successes in language of all the translations which went before. Tyndale's was singularly rich in these, which is the more remarkable, as his other writings do not surpass in beauty or charm of language the average merit of his contemporaries; and though much of his work has been removed in the successive revisions which our Bible has undergone, very much of it still remains: the alterations are for the most part verbal, while the forms and moulds into which he cast the sentences have been to a wonderful extent retained by all who succeeded him. And not merely these, and the

* See his *Answer unto Sir Thomas More's Dialogue*—*Works*, 1573, p. 253.

rhythm which is dependent upon these, are his, but even of his λέξις very much survives. To him we owe such phrases as "turned to flight the armies of the aliens,"* "the author and finisher of our faith;" to him, generally, we owe more than to any single laborer in this field—as, indeed, may be explained partly, though not wholly, from the fact that he was the first to thrust in his sickle into this harvest. So willing were King James's translators to profit by all who went before them, that they did not decline to use what good the Rhemish Version occasionally, though rarely, offered. Thus the felicitous phrase, "the ministry of reconciliation" (2 Cor. v., 18), first appears in it; and the singularly happy rendering of βέβηλος by "profane person" (Heb. xii., 16); and were probably derived from it into our Version. Still, while they were thus indebted to those who went before them in the same sacred office, to Tyndale above all, for innumerable turns of successful translation, which they have not failed to adopt and to make their own, it must not be supposed that very many of these were not of their own introduction. A multitude of phrases which, even more than the rest of Scripture, have become, on account of their beauty and fitness, "household words" and fixed utterances of the religious life of the English people, we owe to them, and they first appear in the Version of 1611; such, for instance, as "the Captain of our salvation" (Heb. ii., 10), "the sin which doth so easily beset us" (Heb. xii., 1), "the Prince of life" (Acts iii., 15).

But in leaving, as I now propose to do, these generals, and entering on particulars, it is needful to make one preliminary observation. He who passes judgment on the English of our version—he, above all, who finds fault with it, should be fairly acquainted with the English of that age in which this Version appeared. Else he may be very unjust to that which he is judging, and charge it with inexactness of rendering,

* It may be said that this is obvious; yet not so. The Rheims does not get nearer to it than "turned away the camp of foreigners."

where, indeed, it was perfectly exact according to the English of the time, and has only ceased to be so now through subsequent changes or modifications in the meaning of words. Few, I am persuaded, who have studied our translation, and tried how far it will bear a strict comparison with the original which it undertakes to represent, but have at times been tempted to make hasty judgments here, and to pass sentences of condemnation, which they have afterward, on better knowledge, seen reason to recall, and to confess their own presumption in making. Certainly, for myself, in many places where I once thought our translators had been wanting in precision of rendering, I now perceive that, according to the English of their own day, their version is exempt from the faintest shadow of blame. It is quite true that their rendering has become in a certain measure inexact for us, but this from circumstances quite beyond their control, namely, through those mutations of language which never cease, and which cause words innumerable to drift imperceptibly away from those meanings which once they owned. In many cases, no doubt, our Authorized Version, by its recognized authority, by an influence silently working, but not the less profoundly felt, has kept words in their places, has given a fixity and stability of meaning to them which otherwise they would not have possessed; but the currents at work in language have been sometimes so strong as to overbear even this controlling power. The most notable examples of the kind which occur to me are the following:

Matt. vi., 25.—"*Take no thought* for your life what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink." This "take no thought" is certainly an inadequate translation in our present English of μὴ μεριμνᾶτε. The precept, as we read it now, seems to exclude and to condemn that just forward-looking care which belongs to man, and differences him from the beasts which live only in the present; and "most English critics have lamented the inadvertence of our Authorized Version, which, in bidding us 'take no thought' for the necessaries of life, pre-

scribes to us what is impracticable in itself, and would be a breach of Christian duty even were it possible."* But there is no "inadvertence" here, nor, in this point at least, at Matt. x., 19. When our translation was made, "Take no thought" was a perfectly correct rendering of μὴ μεριμνᾶτε. "Thought" was then constantly used as equivalent to anxiety or solicitous care, as let witness this passage from Bacon:† "Harris, an alderman in London, was put in trouble, and died with *thought* and anxiety before his business came to an end;" or, still better, this from one of the *Somers Tracts* (its date is of the reign of Elizabeth): "In five hundred years only two queens have died in child-birth. Queen Catharine Parr died rather *of thought*."‡ A yet better example even than either of these is that occurring in Shakespeare's *Julius Cæsar*§ ("*take thought*, and die for Cæsar"), where "to take thought" is to take a matter so seriously to heart that death ensues. A comparison of 1 Sam. ix., 5 with x., 2, and of both with the original text, will make still more evident what force our translators gave to the phrase "take thought."

Luke xiii., 7.—"Why *cumbereth* it the ground?" "Cumbereth" seems here too weak and too negative a rendering of καταργεῖ, a word implying active positive mischief; and so no doubt it is in the present acceptation of "to cumber," which means no more than "to burden." But it was not so always. "To cumber" meant once to vex, annoy, injure, trouble; Spenser speaks of "*cumbrous* gnats." It follows that when Bishop Andrews quotes the present passage,‖ "Why *troubleth* it the ground?" (I do not know from whence he derived this "troubleth," which is not in any of our trans-

* Scrivener, *Notes on the New Testament*, vol. i., p. 162; and comp. Alford, *in loco*.

† *History of Henry the Seventh*. ‡ Vol. i., p. 172.

§ Act ii., sc. 1. *The Paston Letters* (vol. ii., p. 69, ed. 1840) supply another good example; and Golding's *Ovid*, b. x., another:

> "Seven days he sat forlorn upon the bank, and never eat
> A bit of bread. Care, tears and *thought*, and sorrow were his meat."

‖ *Works*, vol. ii., p. 40.

lations), and when Coverdale renders it, "Why *hindereth* it the ground?" they seem, but are not really, more accurate than our own translators were. The employment by these last of "cumber" at Luke x., 40 (the only other place in the Authorized Version where the word occurs), is itself decisive of the sense they ascribed to it. Περιεσπᾶτο (literally "was distracted") is there rendered by them "was cumbered."*

Acts xvii., 23.—"As I passed by and beheld your *devotions*." This was a perfectly correct rendering of σεβάσματα at the time our translation was made, although as much can scarcely be affirmed of it now. "Devotions" is now abstract, and means the mental offerings of the devout worshiper; it was once concrete, and meant the outward objects to which these were rendered, as temples, altars, images, shrines, and the like; "Heiligthümer" De Wette has very happily rendered it; comp. Bel and Drag., 27, and 2 Thess. ii., 4, the only other passage in the New Testament where the word occurs, and where we have rendered πάντα λεγόμενον Θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα, "all that is called God or *that is worshiped*." It is such—not the "devotions" of the Athenians worshiping, but the objects which the Athenians devoutly worshiped—which St. Paul affirms that he "beheld," or, as it would be better, "accurately considered" (ἀναθεωρῶν). Yet the following passage in Sidney's *Arcadia* will bear out our translators, and justify their use of "devotions" as accurate in their time, though no longer accurate in ours: "Dametas began to look big, to march up and down, swearing by no mean *devotions* that the walls should not keep the coward from him."†

* I have no doubt that most readers of that magnificent passage in *Julius Cæsar*, where Antony prophesies over the dead body of Cæsar the ills of which that murder shall be the cause, give to "cumber" a wrong sense in the following lines:

"Domestic fury and fierce civil strife
Shall *cumber* all the parts of Italy."

They understand, shall *load* with corpses of the slain, or, as we say, "encumber"—so at least I understood it long. A good, even a grand sense, but it is not Shakespeare's. He means, shall trouble or mischief.

† I have not removed this paragraph in this second edition; but the fact

Acts xix., 37.—"Ye have brought hither these men, who are neither *robbers of churches* (ἱεροσύλους), nor blasphemers of your goddess." I long counted this "robbers of *churches*," if not positively incorrect, yet a slovenly and indefensible transfer of Christian language to heathen objects; that "robbers *of temples*," or some such phrase, should rather have stood here. But there is no incorrectness in the phrase, as judged by the language of that day. "Church" is in constant use in early English for heathen and Jewish temples as well as for Christian places of worship. I might quote a large array of proofs; I suppose Golding's *Ovid* would yield fifty examples of this use. Two, however, will suffice. In the first, which is from Holland's *Pliny*,* the term is applied to a heathen temple: "This is that Latona which you see in the *Church* of Concordia in Rome;" while in the second, from Sir John Cheke's translation of St. Matthew, it is a name given to the temple at Jerusalem: "And, lo, the veil of the *Church* was torn into two parts from the top downward" (Matt. xxvii., 51).†

Acts xxi., 15.—"After three days we *took up our carriages* and went up to Jerusalem." A critic of the early part of this century makes himself merry with these words, and their inaccurate rendering of the original: "It is not probable that the Cilician tent-maker was either so rich or so lazy." And a more modern objector to the truthfulness of the Acts asks, How could they have taken up their carriages, when there is no road for wheels, nothing but a mountain track, between Cæsarea and Jerusalem? But "carriage" is a constant word in the English of the sixteenth and seventeenth century‡ for

which I had not, but ought to have noted, namely, that our translators give as a marginal reading "gods that you worship, 2 Thess. ii., 4," leaves it, on the whole, more probable that they employed "devotions," not in this objective, but in its modern subjective sense, in which case the rendering is not to be defended.

* Vol. ii., p. 502.

† Again, in Marlowe's *Translation of the First Book of Lucan:*

"These troops should soon pull down the *Church* of Jove."

‡ Spartacus charged his [Lentulus's] lieutenants, that led the army, over-

baggage, being that which men carry, and not, as now, that which carries them. Nor can there be any doubt that it is employed by our translators here, as also in one or two other passages where it occurs, in this sense (Judg. xviii., 21; 1 Sam. xvii., 22); and while so understood, the words "took up our carriages" are a very sufficient rendering of the ἐπισκευασάμενοι of the original. The Geneva has it correctly, though somewhat quaintly, "we trussed up our fardels."

1 Cor. iv., 4.—"I know nothing *by* myself." This hardly conveys any distinct meaning to the English reader, or, if it suggests any, it is a wrong one. In his οὐδὲν ἐμαυτῷ σύνοιδα the apostle would say, "I know nothing of myself," in other words, "*against* myself;" "I have, so far as I can see into my own heart and life, a conscience void of offense." Examples of "by" thus used with the power of our modern "against" are not common even in our early literature, but from time to time occur. Thus, in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, an inquisitor to a poor woman whom he is examining, "Thou hast spoken evil words *by* the queen;" and she answers, "No man living upon earth can prove any such things *by* me."*

Ephes. iv., 3.—"*Endeavoring* to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." Passages like this, in which the verb "endeavor" occurs, will sometimes seem to have been carelessly and loosely translated, when, indeed, they were rendered with perfect accuracy according to the English of that day. "Endeavor," it has been well said, "once denoted all possible tension, the highest energy that could be directed to an object. With us it means the last feeble, hopeless attempt of a person who knows that he can not accomplish his aim, but makes a conscience of going through some formalities for the purpose of showing that the failure is not his fault."† More than one passage suffers from this

threw them, and took all their *carriage*" [τὴν ἀποσκευὴν ἅπασαν]. North's *Plutarch's Lives*, p. 470.

* *Examination of Elizabeth Young by Martin Hussie.*

† *Lincoln's-Inn Sermons*, by F. D. Maurice, p. 156.

change in the force of "endeavor," as 2 Pet. i., 15, and this from the Ephesians still more. If we attach to "endeavor" its present meaning, we may too easily persuade ourselves that the apostle does no more than bid us to attempt to preserve this unity, and that he quite recognizes the possibility of our being defeated in the attempt. He does no such thing; he assumes success. Σπουδάζοντες means "giving all diligence," and "endeavoring" meant no less two centuries and a half ago.

1 Tim. v., 4.—"If any widow have children or *nephews*." But why, it has been asked, are ἔκγονα translated "nephews" here, and not "grandchildren" or "descendants?" and why should "nephews" be specially charged with this duty of supporting their relatives? The answer is, that "nephews" (="nepotes") was the constant word for grandchildren and other lineal descendants, as witness the following passages; this from Hooker: "With what intent they [the apocryphal books] were first published, those words of the *nephew* of Jesus do plainly signify, 'After that my *grandfather* Jesus had given himself to the reading of the Law and of the Prophets, he purposed also to write something pertaining to learning and wisdom;'"* and this from Holland: "The warts, black moles, spots, and freckles of fathers, not appearing at all upon their own children's skin, begin afterward to put forth and show themselves in their *nephews*, to wit, the children of their sons and daughters."† There is no doubt that "nephews" is so used here, as also at Judges xii., 14. Yet it has misled a scholar so accurate as the late Professor Blunt, who, writing of the apostolic times, urges that in them the duties of piety extended so far, that not children only, but "nephews," were expected to support their aged relations.‡

1 Pet. ii., 4, 5.—"To whom coming, as unto a living stone, . . . . ye also as *lively* stones are built up." Many probably

* *Ecclesiastical Polity*, b. v., c. xx.
† *Plutarch's Morals*, p. 555.
‡ *Church of the First Three Centuries*, p. 27.

before now have wondered and regretted that λίθον ζῶντα being translated "a *living* stone," λίθοι ζῶντες, which follows immediately after, should be no more than "*lively* stones;" "living," as applied to Christ, being thus brought down to "lively," as applied to Christians, with no corresponding reduction in the original to warrant it. Now I think it certainly is to be regretted that our translators did not retain one and the same word, namely, "living," in both places, seeing that they found one and the same in their original. Still, for all this, it must not be forgotten that "lively" was far more nearly equipollent to "living" once than now it is, even if it was not so altogether. Examples in proof are given below.*

I can not but think that, in case of a revision, words like these, which have imperceptibly shifted their position since our translation was made, should be exchanged for others now occupying the place which they occupied once. Such words, current intellectual money still, but whose value is different now from what once it was, are more perilous, more likely to deceive than words wholly obsolete. The last are like rocks which stand out from the sea; we are warned of their presence, and there is little danger of our making shipwreck upon them. But words like those just cited, as familiar now as they ever have been, but employed in quite different meanings from those which they once possessed, are hidden rocks, which give no notice of their presence, and on which we may be shipwrecked, if I may so say, without so much as being aware of it. It would be manifestly desirable that these unnoticed obstacles to our seizing the exact sense of Scripture—obstacles which no carelessness of our translators, but which Time in its onward course, has placed in our way—should be removed. "Res fugiunt, vocabula manent"

* "Had I but seen thy picture in this plight,
It would have madded me. What shall I do,
Now I behold thy *lively* body so?"
*Titus Andronicus*, Act iii., sc. 1.

"That his dear father might interment have,
See, the young man entered a *lively* grave."
Massinger, *The Fatal Dowry*, Act ii., sc. 1.

—this is the eternal law of *things* in their relation to *words*, and it renders necessary at certain intervals a readjustment of the two.

Let me too observe that in thus changing that which by the silent changes of time has become liable to mislead, we should only be working in the spirit, and according to the manifest intention, which in their time guided the translators of 1611. They evidently contemplated as part of their task the removing from *their* revision of such words as in the lapse of years had become to their contemporaries unintelligible or misleading. For instance, "to depart" no longer meant to separate; and just as at a later day, in 1661, "till death us *depart*" was changed in the Marriage Service for that which now stands there, "till death us *do part*," so in their revision "separate" was substituted for "depart" ("*depart* us from the love of God") at Rom. viii., 39. "To allow" hardly meant any longer "to praise" (allaudare), "to have pleasure in;" it was not, therefore, suffered to remain as the rendering of *εὐδοκεῖν*, Heb. xii., 8, though, with a certain inconsistency, it was left at Luke xi., 48 as the rendering of *συνευδοκεῖν*: "consent," which the Rheims has, is perhaps a little too weak, yet preferable there.

At Matt. xxiii., 25, we have another example of the same. The words stood there up to the time of the Geneva version, "Ye make clean the outer side of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of *bribery* and excess." "Bribery," however, about their time was losing, or had lost, its meaning of rapine or extortion, and was, therefore, no longer a fit rendering of *ἁρπαγή*; the "bribour" or "briber" was not equivalent to the robber: they therefore did wisely and well in exchanging "bribery" for "extortion" here. They dealt in the same spirit with "noisome" at 1 Tim. vi., 9. In the earlier versions of the English Church, and up to their revision, it stood, "They that will be rich fall into temptation and snares, and into many foolish and *noisome* (*βλαβερὰς*) lusts." "Noisome," that is, when those translations were made, was sim-

ply equivalent to noxious or hurtful;* but in the beginning of the seventeenth century it was acquiring a new meaning, the same which it now retains, namely, that of exciting disgust rather than that of doing actual hurt or harm. Thus a tiger would have been "noisome" in old English; a skunk or a polecat would be "noisome" in modern. Here was reason enough for the change which they made.

Indeed, our only complaint against them in this matter is, that they did not carry out this side of their revision consistently and to the full. Thus they have suffered the very word last mentioned, "noisome" I mean, to remain in some other passages from which it should no less have disappeared. Three or four of these occur in the Old Testament, as Job xxxi., 40; Psa. xci., 3; Ezek. xiv., 21; only one in the New, Rev. xvi., 2, where κακὸν ἕλκος is certainly not "a *noisome* sore" in our sense of "noisome," that is, offensive or disgusting, but an "evil," or, as the Rheims has it, "a *cruel* sore." It is the same with "by-and-by." This, when they wrote, was ceasing to mean "immediately." The inveterate procrastination of men had caused it to designate a remoter term, even as "presently" does not any longer mean "at this present," but "in a little while;" and "to *intend* any thing" is not now "earnestly to do," but "to purpose doing it." They did well, therefore, that in many cases, as at Mark ii., 12, they did not leave "by-and-by" as a rendering of εὐθέως and εὐθύς. They would have done still better if they had removed it in every case, and not suffered it in four places (Matt. xiii., 21; Mark vi., 25; Luke xvii., 7; xxi., 9) to remain.

Again, "to grudge" was ceasing in their time to have the sense of "to murmur openly," and was already signifying "to repine inwardly;" a "grudge" was no longer an open utterance of discontent and displeasure at the dealings of another,†

* "He [the superstitious person] is persuaded that they be gods indeed, but such as be *noisome*, hurtful, and doing mischief unto men." Holland, *Plutarch's Morals*, p. 260.

† "Yea, without *grudging*, Christ suffered the cruel Jews to crown him

but a secret resentment thereupon entertained. It was only proper, therefore, that they should replace "to grudge" by "to murmur," and a "grudge" by a "murmuring," in such passages as Mark xiv., 5; Acts vi., 1. On two occasions, however, they have suffered "grudge" to stand, where it no longer conveys to us with accuracy the meaning of the original, and even in their time must have failed to do so. These are 1 Pet. iv., 9, where they render *ἄνευ γογγυσμῶν*, "without grudging," and James v., 9, where *μὴ στενάζετε* is rendered "Grudge not."* These renderings were inherited from their predecessors, but their retention was an oversight.

In another instance our translators have failed to carry out to the full the substitution of a more appropriate phrase for one, which indeed, unlike those others, could have been at no time worthy of praise, or any thing else than more or less misleading. They plainly felt that "Easter," which had designated first a heathen, and then a Christian festival, was not happily used to set forth a Jewish feast, even though that might occupy the same place in the Jewish calendar which Easter occupied in the Christian; and they therefore removed "Easter" from places out of number where in the earlier versions it had stood as the rendering of Πάσχα, substituting "Passover" in its room. With all this, they have suffered "Easter" in a single instance — at Acts xii., 4, "intending after *Easter* to bring him forth to the people"—to remain; sometimes, I am sure, to the perplexity of the English reader. "Jewry," in like manner, which has been replaced by "Judæa" almost every where else, has yet been allowed, I must needs believe by the same oversight, twice to continue (Luke xxiii., 5; John vii., 1).

with most sharp thorns, and to strike him with a reed." *Examination of William Thorpe*, in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*.

* As an evidence of the perplexity which "grudge," used as it is here, was calculated to create, see Manton's *Commentary on St. James*, *in loco*, 1651, p. 549, who is "unwilling to recede from our own translation," but is unable to accept "Grudge not," to which he gives its modern sense, as a fair rendering of *μὴ στενάζετε*, which indeed, so regarded, it is not.

Thus much in regard of obsolete *uses* of words not in themselves obsolete; but the way of dealing with words actually themselves obsolete is not by any means so clear. It does not, indeed, seem difficult to lay down a rule here; the difficulties mainly attend its application. The rule seems to me to be this: Where words have become perfectly unintelligible to the great body of those for whom the translation is made, the ἰδιῶται of the Church, they ought clearly to be exchanged for others; for the Bible works not as a charm, but as reaching the heart and conscience through the intelligent faculties of its hearers and readers. Thus is it with "taches," "ouches," "knops," "neesings," "mufflers," "wimples," "habergeon," "brigandine," "bolled," "ear" (*arare*), "daysman," in the Old Testament, words dark even to scholars, where their scholarship is rather in Latin and Greek than in early English. Of these, however, there is hardly one in the New Testament. There is, indeed, in it no inconsiderable amount of archaism, but of a quite different character; words which, while they are felt by our people to be old and unusual, are yet, if I do not deceive myself, perfectly understood by them, by wise and simple, educated and uneducated alike. These, shedding round the sacred volume the reverence of age, removing it from the ignoble associations which will often cleave to the language of the day, should on no account be touched, but rather thankfully acknowledged and carefully preserved. "The dignity resulting from archaisms,"* in Bishop Horsley's words, "is not to be too readily given up." For, indeed, it is good that the phraseology of Scripture should not be exactly that of our common life; that it should be removed from the vulgarities, and even the familiarities, of this; just as there is a sense of fitness which dictates that the architecture of a church should be different from that of a house.

It might seem superfluous to urge this, yet it is far from so being. It is well-nigh incredible what words it has been

* *Biblical Criticism*, vol. iii., p. 301.

sometimes proposed to dismiss from our version on the ground that they "are now almost or entirely obsolete." Symonds thinks "clean escaped" (2 Peter ii., 18) "a very low expression;" and, on the plea of obsoleteness, Wemyss proposed to get rid of "straightway," "haply," "twain," "athirst," "wax," "lack," "ensample," "jeopardy," "garner," "passion," with a multitude of other words not a whit more aloof from our ordinary use. Purver, whose *New and Literal Translation of the Old and New Testament* appeared in 1764, has an enormous list of expressions that are "clownish, barbarous, base, hard, technical, misapplied, or new coined," and among these are "beguile," "boisterous," "lineage," "perseverance," "potentate," "remit," "seducers," "shorn," "swerved," "vigilant," "unloose," "unction," "vocation." For each of these (many hundreds in number) he proposes to substitute some other.

And the same worship of the fleeting present, of the transient fashions of the hour in language, with the same contempt of that stable past which in all likelihood will be the enduring future, long after these fashions have passed away and are forgotten, manifests itself to an extravagant degree in the version of the American Bible Union. It needs but for a word to have the slightest suspicion of age upon it, to have ceased, it may be only for the moment, to be the current money of the street and the market-place, and there is nothing for it but peremptory exclusion. "Chasten" and "chastening," "to better," "to faint," "to quicken," "conversation," "saints," "wherefore," "straitly," "wroth," with hundreds more, are thrust out, avowedly upon this plea, and modern substitutes introduced in their room. I can fancy no more effectual scheme for debasing the version, nor, if it were admitted as the law of revision, for the lasting impoverishment of the English tongue. One can only compare this course with a custom of the Fiji islanders, who, as soon as their relations begin to show signs of age, put them out of the way. They, however, have at least this to say for them-

selves, that these old would grow older, more helpless, more burdensome every day. It is nothing of the kind with the words which, on something of a similar plea, are forcibly dismissed. A multitude of these, often the most precious ones, after a period of semi-obsoleteness, of withdrawal from active service for a while, obtain a second youth, pass into free and unquestioned currency again. In proof of this, we need only to refer to such a document as Speght's *Glossary* of "old and obscure words" in Chaucer, of date 1667.* A very large proportion of these are not "old" and not "obscure," have not the faintest shadow of obsoleteness clinging to them at the present. But nothing would so effectually hinder this rejuvenescence, this *palingenesy* of words, as the putting a ban upon them directly they pass out of vulgar use; as this resolution, that if they have withdrawn for ever so brief a time from the every-day service of men, they shall never be permitted to return to it again. A true lover of his native tongue will adopt another course.

"Obscurata diu populo bonus eruet;"

and words which are in danger of disappearing, instead of bidding them begone, he will do his best to win back and to detain.

This retaining of the old diction in all places where a higher interest, that, namely, of being understood by all, did not imperatively require the substitution of another phrase, would be most needful, not merely for the reverence which attaches to it, and for the avoiding every unnecessary disturbance in the minds of the people, but for the shunning of another danger, which ought not lightly to be hazarded. Were the substitution of new for old carried out to any large extent, this most injurious consequence would follow, namely, that our translation would be no longer of a piece, not any more one web and woof, but in part English of the seventeenth century, in part English of the nineteenth. Now, granting that

* See some more proofs of the same in my *English Past and Present*, fourth edition, p. 80.

English of the nineteenth century is as good as English of the seventeenth, of which there may be very reasonable doubts, still they are not the same; the differences between them are considerable. Some of these differences we can explain, others we must be content only to feel. But even those who could not explain any part of them would yet be conscious of them, would be pained by such a work in a sense of incongruity, of new patches on an old garment, and of those failing to agree with this.* Now all will admit that it is of vast importance that the Bible of the nation should be a book capable of being read with delight—I mean quite apart from its higher claim as God's Word to be read with devoutest reverence and honor. It can be so now. But the sense of pleasure and satisfaction in it, I mean merely as the foremost English classic, would be greatly impaired by any alterations which seriously affected the homogeneousness of its style. And this, it must be remembered, is a danger altogether new, one which did not at all beset the former revisions. From Tyndale's first edition of his New Testament in 1526 to the Authorized Version there elapsed in all but eighty-five years, and this period was broken up into four or five briefer portions by Cranmer's, Coverdale's, the Geneva, the Bishops' Bible, which were published in the interval between one date and the other. But from the date of King James's Translation (1611) to the present day nearly two

* The same objection would attend the introduction of words in themselves old, but employed in modern senses, such as were quite foreign to them when our Version was made. For instance, the American Bible Union substitutes "reflexion" for "discretion," as a rendering of מְזִמָּה, Prov. ii., 11. But "reflexion" was not used to designate a *mental* operation till toward the end of the seventeenth century. It belongs to the Lockian period of mental philosophy, not to the Baconian; if, indeed, Locke himself was not the first to employ "reflexion" in this sense. Webster, in like manner, substitutes "expire" for "give up the ghost;" but "expire," in this sense at least, belongs also to the latter half, not to the former, of the same century. He substitutes "plunder" for "spoil"—a worse error; for "to plunder," as is familiar to most, was a word unknown to the language till it was brought here, just about the beginning of our Civil Wars, by some who had served under Gustavus Adolphus in Germany.

hundred and fifty years have elapsed; and more than this time, it can not be doubted, will have elapsed before any steps are actually taken in this matter. When we argue for the facilities of revision now from the facilities of revision on previous occasions, we must not forget that the long interval of time which has elapsed since our last review of the English text, so very much longer than lay between any of the preceding, has in many ways immensely complicated the problem, has made many precautions necessary now, which would have been superfluous then.*

Certainly, too, when we read what manner of stuff is offered to us in exchange for the language of our Authorized Version, we learn to prize it more highly than ever. Indeed, we hardly know the immeasurable worth of its religious diction till we set this side by side with what oftentimes is proffered in its room. Thus, not to speak of some suggested changes which would be positively offensive, we should scarcely be gainers in perspicuity or accuracy if for Jam. i., 8, which now stands "A double-minded man is unstable in all his ways," we were to read, "A man unsteady in his opinions is unconstant in all his actions" (Wemyss). Our gains would not be greater if "Count it all joy when ye fall into divers tempta-

* It is an eminent merit in the *Revision of the Authorized Version by Five Clergymen*, of which the Gospel of St. John and the Epistle to the Romans have already appeared, that they have not merely urged by precept, but shown by proof, that it is possible to revise our Version, and at the same time to preserve unimpaired the character of the English in which it is composed. Nor is it only on this account that we may accept this work as by far the most hopeful contribution which we have yet had to the solution of a great and difficult problem, but also as showing that where reverent hands touch that building, which some would have wholly pulled down that it might be wholly built up again, these find only the need of here and there replacing a stone which had been incautiously built into the wall, or which, trustworthy material once, has now yielded to the lapse and injury of time, while they leave the building itself in its main features and frame-work untouched. Differing as the revisers occasionally do even among themselves, they will not wonder that others sometimes differ from the conclusions at which they have arrived; but there can, I think, be no difference upon this point, namely, that their work deserves the most grateful recognition of the Church.

tions" (Jam. i., 2) were replaced, as Turnbull, one of our latest workers in this field, would have it, by the following: "Keep yourselves perfectly cheerful when you are exposed to a variety of trials." So, too, the first clause of Col. ii., 22 may not be very satisfactory as it now stands; yet who would recognize "injunctions which are all detrimental by their improper use," which is Turnbull's again, as indeed an improved translation? Neither would the advantage be very evident if "I have a baptism to be baptized with" (Luke xii., 50) gave place to "I have an immersion to undergo." "Wrath to come" we may well be contented to retain, though we are offered "impending vengeance" in its place. "Shall cut him asunder" is certainly a more vigorous, not to say a more accurate rendering of ἐκκοτομήσει than "will punish him with the utmost severity" (Matt. xxiv., 51). There is not so great plainness of speech in "the deadness of Sarah's womb" that it needs to be exchanged for "Sarah's incapacity for childbearing" (Rom. iv., 20).* "In chambering and wantonness" would not be improved on even though we were to substitute for it "in unchaste and immodest gratifications." Dr. Campbell's work "*On the Four Gospels*" contains dissertations which have their value; yet the profit would be small of superseding Mark vi., 19, 20, as it now stands, by the following: "This roused Herodias's resentment, who would have killed John, but could not, because Herod respected him, and, knowing him to be a just and holy man, protected him, and did many things recommended by him, and heard him with pleasure." Of Harwood's *Liberal Translation of the New Testament* (London, 1768), and the follies of it, not very far from blasphemous, it is unnecessary to give any specimens.

* I thought at first that it was the mere love of slip-slop in the place of genuine English which had induced this change; but when, turning to another page of Mr. Sawyer's new Version (Boston, 1858), from which this and the last specimen are drawn, I met, "Can he become an unborn infant of his mother a second time?" substituted for "Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb?" (John iii., 4), I at once recognized that it was that exaggerated sense of propriety, so rife in America, which we more justly count impropriety, that dictated both these alterations.

When we consider, not the words of our Version one by one, but the words in combination, as they are linked to one another, and by their position influence and modify one another—in short, the accidence and the syntax, this, being good, is yet not so good as the selection of the words themselves. There are undoubtedly inaccuracies and negligences here. Bishop Lowth long ago pointed out several faults in the grammatical construction of sentences;* and although it must be confessed that now and then he is hypercritical, and that his objections will not stand, yet others which he has not pressed would be found to supply the place of those which must therefore be withdrawn.

But here too, and before entering on this matter, there is room for the same observation which was made in respect of the *words* of our translation. Many charges have also been lightly and ignorantly, some presumptuously, made. Our translators now and then appear ungrammatical because they give us, as they needs must, the grammar of their own day, and not the grammar of ours.† It is curious to find Bishop Newcome‡ taking them to task for using "his" or "her" where they ought to have used "its," as in passages like the following: "But if the salt have lost *his* savor, wherewith shall *it* be salted?" (Matt. v., 13). "Charity doth not behave *itself* unseemly, seeketh not *her* own" (1 Cor. xiii., 5; comp.

* In his *Short Introduction to English Grammar.*

† The French Academy, in the Preface to the new *Dictionnaire Historique de la Langue Française*, has some excellent remarks in respect of acts of similar injustice which often are committed, p. xv.: "Ces écrivains y seront quelquefois défendus contre d'indiscrètes critiques, qui leur ont reproché comme des fautes de langage ce qui n'était que l'emploi légitime de la langue de leur temps. A chaque époque s'établissent des habitudes, des conventions, des règles même, auxquelles n'ont pu assurément se conformer par avance les écrivains des époques antérieures, et qu'il n'est ni juste ni raisonnable de leur opposer, comme s'il s'agissait de ces premiers principes dont l'autorité est absolue et universelle. C'est pourtant en vertu de cette jurisprudence rétroactive qu'ont été condamnées, chez d'excellents auteurs, des manières de parler alors admises, et auxquelles un long abandon n'a pas toujours enlevé ce qu'elles avaient de grâce et de vivacité."

‡ *Historical View of the English Biblical Translations*, Dublin, 1792, p. 289.

Rev. xxii., 2). "This sometimes," he complains, "introduces strange confusion." But this "confusion," as he calls it, "this inaccuracy in grammar," as Webster has styled it, was indeed no confusion, no inaccuracy at all. When our translators wrote, it was inevitable, or at least could only be avoided by circumlocutions, as by the use of "thereof;" nor, moreover, did this usage present itself as any confounding of masculine and neuter, or of personal and impersonal, at the time when our Version was made; for then that very serviceable, but often very inharmonious little word "its," as a genitive of "it," had not appeared, or had only just appeared, timidly and rarely, in the language,* and "his" was quite as much a neuter as a masculine.

Others have in other points found fault with the grammar of our Version where, in like manner, they "have condemned the guiltless," their objections frequently serving only to reveal their own unacquaintance with the history and past evolution of their native tongue—an unacquaintance excusable enough in others, yet hardly in those who set themselves up as critics and judges in so serious and solemn a matter as is

* I have elsewhere entered on this matter somewhat more fully (*English Past and Present*, 4th ed., p. 128 *sqq.*), and have there observed that "its" nowhere occurs in our Authorized Version. Lev. xxv., 5 ("of *its* own accord"), which had been urged as invalidating my assertion, does not so really; for reference to the first, or, indeed, to any of the early editions, will show that in them the passage stood "of *it* own accord." Nor is "it" here a misprint for "its;" for we have exactly the same "by *it* own accord" in the Geneva Version, Acts xii., 10; and in other English books of the beginning of the seventeenth century, which never employ "its." Thus, in Rogers's *Naaman the Syrian*, published in 1642, but the lectures delivered some eight years earlier: "I am at this mark, to withdraw the soul from the life of *it* own hand," *Preface*, p. 1.; and again: "The power of the Spirit is such that it blows at *it* own pleasure," p. 441; and once more: "The scope which mercy proposes to herself in the turning of the soul to God, even the glory of *it* own self," p. 442. There are a few examples of "its" in Shakespeare, but several of "it," as it were gradually preparing the other's way. Thus, in *The Winter's Tale*, Act iii., sc. 2: "The innocent milk in *it* most innocent mouth;" and again, *King John*, Act ii., sc. 1: "Go to *it* grandame, child." There is a full treatment of this word, with notices of the first appearance of it, in Mr. Craik's very valuable work, *On the English of Shakespeare*, p. 91.

here brought into judgment. This ignorance is indeed sometimes surprising. Thus Wemyss* complains of a false concord at Rev. xviii., 17: "For in one hour so great *riches is* come to naught." He did not know that "riches" is properly no plural at all, and the final "s" in it no sign of a plural, but belonging to the word in its French form, "richesse," and that "riches" has only become a plural, as "alms" and "eaves" are becoming, and "peas" has become, such, through a general forgetfulness of this fact. When Wicliffe wants a plural he adds another "s," and writes "richessis" (Rom. ii., 4; Jam. v., 2). At the same time it is undoubtedly true that, when our Version was made, "riches" was already commonly regarded and dealt with as a plural; in this Version itself it is generally so used,† and therefore it would have been better for consistency's sake if they had made no exception here; but there is no grammatical error in the case any more than when Shakespeare writes, "The *riches* of the ship *is* come to shore." The same objector finds fault with "asked *an alms*" (Acts iii., 3), and suggests "asked *some alms*" in its room, evidently on the same assumption that "alms" is plural. Neither can he tolerate our rendering of 1 Tim. v., 23: "Use a little wine for thine *often* infirmities;" but complains of "often," an adverb, here used as though it were an adjective; while, indeed, the adjectival use of "oft," "often," surviving still in "*oft*times," "*often*times," is the primary, the adverbial merely secondary.

But, all frivolous, ungrounded objections set aside, there will still remain a certain number of passages where the grammatical construction is capable of improvement. In general, the very smallest alteration will set every thing right. These are some:

Heb. v., 8.—"Though he *were* a Son, yet learned he obe-

* *Biblical Gleanings*, p. 212.

† But not always; for at Jer. xlviii., 36 it stood in the early editions, "The *riches* that he hath gotten *is* perished." In such modern editions as I have consulted, "is" has been tacitly changed into "are."

dience by the things which he suffered." If the apostle had been putting a possible hypothetical case, this would be correct; for example, "*Though he slay* me, yet will I trust in him" (Job xiii., 15), is without fault. But here, on the contrary, he is assuming a certain conceded fact, that Christ *was* a Son, and that, being such, and though he *was* such, yet in this way of suffering he learned obedience. "Though" is here a concessive conditional particle, the Latin "etsi" or "etiamsi" as followed by an indicative, and should have itself been followed by such in our Version. It ought to be, "Though he *was* a Son, etc."

John ix., 31.—"If any man be a worshiper of God, and *doeth* his will, him he heareth." As in the passage just noted we have a subjunctive instead of an indicative, an actual objective fact dealt with as though it were only a possible subjective conception, so here we have just the converse, an indicative instead of a subjunctive. It is true that in modern English the subjunctive is so rapidly disappearing, that "If any man *doeth* his will" might very well pass. Still it was an error when our translators wrote; and there is, at any rate, an inconcinnity in allowing the indicative "doeth," in the second clause of the sentence, to follow the subjunctive "be" in the first, both equally depending upon "if:" one would gladly, therefore, see a return to "*do* his will," which stood in Tyndale's version.

1 John v., 15.—"And if we know that he *hear* us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of him." In this sentence the two verbs "know" and "hear" are not *both* dependent on "if," but only the former; "hear," therefore, inherited from Tyndale, is incorrect, and the correction of the Geneva version should have been admitted: "And if we know that he *heareth* us, etc."

Matt. xvi., 15.—"*Whom* say ye that I am?" The English is faulty here. It ought plainly to be, "*Who* say ye that I am;" as is evident if only "who" be put last: "Ye say that I am *who?*" The Latin idiom, "*Quem* me esse dicitis?"

probably led our translators, and all who went before them, astray. Yet the cases are not in the least parallel. If the English idiom had allowed the question to assume this shape, "*Whom* say ye me to be?" then the Latin form would have been a true parallel, and also a safe guide; the accusative "*whom*," not, indeed, as governed by "say," but as correlative to the accusative "*me*," being then the only correct case, as the nominative "who," to answer to the nominative "I," is the only correct one in the passage as it now stands. The mistake repeats itself on several occasions; thus, at Matthew xvi., 13; Mark viii., 27, 29; Luke ix., 18, 20; Acts xiii., 25.

Heb. ix., 5.—"And over it the *cherubims* of glory." But "cherubim" being already plural, it is excess of expression to add another, an English plural, to the Hebrew, which our translators on this one occasion of the word's occurrence in the New Testament, and always in the Old, have done. Their choice was between "cherubim" or "cherubs." In this latter case they would have dealt with "cherub" as a naturalized English word, forming an English plural. There would have been nothing to object to this, just as there would be nothing to object to "automatons" or "terminuses," which ultimately, no doubt, will be the plurals of "automaton" and "terminus," as "dogmas" and not "dogmata" (Hammond) is now the plural of "dogma;" while there would be much to object to "automatas," or "terminies," or to "erratas," though, strangely enough, we find this in Jeremy Taylor, as we do "synonymas" in Mede. It might be free to use either "geniuses" or "genii" as the plural of "genius" (we do, in fact, employ both, though, like the Latin "loci" and "loca," in different senses), but not "geniies;" and it is exactly this sort of error into which our translators have here fallen.

Phil. ii., 3.—"Let *each* esteem other better than *themselves*." Compare with this Rev. xx., 13: "They were judged, *every man* according to *their* works." The same exception must be taken against both passages. "Each" and "every," though alike implying many, alike resolve that many into its units,

and refer to it in these its constituent parts, with only the difference that "each" segregates, and "every" aggregates the units which compose it.

Rev. xxi., 12.—"And *had* a wall great and high." The verb "had" is here without a nominative. All that is necessary is to return to Wicliffe's translation: "And *it* had a wall great and high."

Again, we much regret the frequent use of adjectives ending in "ly" as though they were adverbs. This termination, being that of so great a number of our adverbs, easily lends itself to the mistake, and at the same time often serves to conceal it. Thus our translators at 1 Cor. xiii., 5 say of charity that it "doth not behave itself *unseemly*." Now this, at first hearing, does not sound to many as an error, because the final "ly" of the adjective "unseemly" causes it to pass with them as though it were an adverb; but substitute another equivalent adjective—say "doth not behave itself *improper*," or "doth not behave itself *unbefitting*"—and the violation of the laws of grammar makes itself felt at once. Compare Tit. ii., 12: "soberly, righteously, and *godly* in this present world." It ought to be "godlily" here, as "unseemlily" in the other passage; or, if this repetition of the final "ly" is unpleasing to the ear, as indeed it is, then some other word should be sought. The error, which, it must be owned, can plead some of the greatest names in English literature in its support, recurs in 2 Tim. iii., 12; Jude 15; and is not unfrequent in the Prayer-book. Thus we find it in the Thirty-sixth Article: "We decree all such to be rightly, *orderly*, and lawfully consecrated.*

* It is curious to note how frequent are the errors arising from the same cause. Thus I remember meeting in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* (I have not the exact reference) the words "if this be *perpend*." Here it is clear that Foxe was for the moment deceived by the termination of "perpend," so like the usual termination of the past participle, and did not observe that he ought to have written "if this be *perpended*." How often we hear of the "*Diocletian* persecution:" the English is here as faulty as if we were to speak of the "*Decius* persecution:" so, too, of the "*Novatian* schism." In each case the final "an" deceives. In our own day Tennyson treats "eaves" as if the

Should a revision of our version ever be attempted, it seems to me that the same principle should rule in dealing with archaic forms as I have sought to lay down in respect of archaic words. Nothing but necessity should provoke alteration; thus there can be no question but that our old English præterites "clave," "drave," "sware," "tare," "brake," "spake," "strake," and I think also "lift," should stand. They are as good English now as they were two centuries and a half ago: in many cases they are the forms still in use among our common people, if not in towns, yet in the country; and even where they are not, they create no perplexity in the minds of any, but serve profitably to difference the language of Scripture from the language of common and every-day life. It is otherwise, as it seems to me, with archaisms which are in positive opposition to the present usage of the English tongue. Thus "his" and "her" should be replaced by "its" at such passages as Matt. v., 13; Mark ix., 50; Luke xiv., 34; Rev. xxii., 2; 1 Cor. xiii., 5; which might be done almost without exciting the least observation; so also "which" by "who," wherever a person, and not a thing, is referred to. This, too, might be easily done; for our translators have no certain law here: for instance, in the last chapter of the Romans, "which" occurs seven times, referring to a person or persons, "who" exactly as often. The only temptation to retain this use of "which" would be to mark by its aid the distinction between ὅστις and ὅς, so hard to seize in English. At the same time, a retention with this view would involve many changes, seeing that our translators did *not* turn "which" to this special service, but for ὅς and ὅστις employed "who" and "which" quite promiscuously.

final "s" were the sign of the plural, which being dismissed, one might have "eave" for a singular; and he writes "the cottage *eave;*" but "eaves" ("efese" in the Anglo-Saxon) is itself the singular. With the same momentary inadvertence Lord Macaulay deals with the final "s" in "Cyclops" as though it were the plural sign, and speaks in one of the late volumes of his history of a "Cyclop;" and pages might be filled with mistakes which have their origin in similar causes.

Before leaving this part of the subject, it may be well to observe that a large amount of tacit unacknowledged revision of our version has found place at different times, leading to the removal of many antiquated forms, out of which it results that a copy of the Authorized Bible at the present day differs in many details from the same as it first was issued by the king's printer, though professing to be absolutely identical with it. It would be hypercritical to object to all which has been in this way done, though one hardly sees by what right the changes, however desirable, were made. The following alterations, which have come under my eye, may be noticed. "Moe," which stood in several places in the exemplar edition (at John iv., 41; Gal. iv., 27), has been replaced by "more;" "fet," the old perfect of "fetch," is now printed "fetched" (Acts xxviii., 13); "lift," where it stands as a perfect, has been altered to "lifted" (Luke xi., 27; Acts ix., 41), yet not uniformly, for in more than one place "lift" has been allowed to stand (Luke xvi., 23). "Kinred," the older form of the word, has every where been changed into "kindred;" and "flix"—this, too, the older form*—has in like manner yielded to "flux" (Acts xxviii., 8). "Apollo" stood in several places instead of "Apollos," which in like manner has been removed (1 Cor. iii., 22; iv., 6); "ought," as the perfect of "owe," has been changed into "owed" (Matt. xviii., 24, 28; Luke vii., 41); the stately "Hierusalem" has every where been changed to "Jerusalem." Less to be justified than any of these is the change of "broided," another form of "braided," into "broidered" (1 Tim. ii., 9); while least excusable of all is the change of "shame*fast*ness," in the same verse, into "shame*faced*ness," another and later word growing out of the corruption of the earlier. "Shamefastness" is formed upon "shamefast," that is, "fast," or established, in honorable "shame;" just as "steadfastness" on "steadfast," "soothfastness" on "soothfast," "rootfastness"—a good old word now let go—on "rootfast." To change this into "shame*faced*-

* See Holland, *Pliny's Natural History*, vol. ii., pp. 37, 39, 40, and often.

ness" is to allow all the meaning and force of the word to run to the surface, to leave it ethically a far inferior word, and marks an unfaithful guardianship of the text, both on their part who first introduced, and theirs who have so long allowed the change.

## CHAPTER IV.

### ON SOME QUESTIONS OF TRANSLATION, AND THE ANSWERS TO THEM WHICH OUR TRANSLATORS GAVE.

I HAVE already touched in the second chapter, devoted exclusively to this subject, on various graver difficulties which lie in the path of the translator, some of which it is only given him at the best partially to overcome, others of which will wholly overcome him. But, besides these harder questions, not to be solved, or to be solved only in part, there are others, themselves also oftentimes hard enough, which will offer themselves for his solution—which will meet him, so to speak, on the very threshold of his work. I propose in this chapter a little to consider what sort of answer our own translators have given to some of these questions, as they presented themselves to them. It need scarcely be observed that, wherever they acquiesced in and adopted the answers which their predecessors had given, they did by this course make these their own, and we have a right to regard them as responsible for such.

Let us take, first, a question which in all translation is constantly recurring—this, namely: In what manner ought technical words of the one language, which have no exact equivalents in the other, which indeed can not have, because the exact thing itself is not there, to be rendered; measures, for instance, of wet and dry, as the *βάτος* and *κόρος* of Luke xvi., 6, 7; the *μετρητής* of John ii., 6; coins, such as the *δίδραχμον* of Matt. xvii., 24; the *στατήρ* of Matt. xvii., 27; the *δραχμή* of Luke xv., 8; titles of honor and authority which have long since passed away, and to which, at best, only remote resemblances now exist, as the *γραμματεύς* and *νεωκόρος* of Acts xix., 35; the *Ἀσιάρχαι* of the same chapter, ver. 31; the *ἀνθύπατος* of Acts xiii., 7?

The ways in which such words may be dealt with reduce themselves to four, and our translators, by turns, have recourse to them all. The first, which is only possible when the etymology of the word shines clearly and transparently through it, is to seize this, and to set against the one word another, either adopted or newly coined, which shall utter over again in the language of the translation what the original word uttered in its own. It is thus, for instance, with Cicero's "indolentia," which he invented and set over against the ἀπάθεια of the Stoics; his "veriloquium," as against the Greek ἐτυμολογία. This course was chosen when our translators rendered Ἄρειος πάγος, "Mars Hill" (Acts xvii., 22), τετράδιον, "quaternion" (Acts xii., 4), Λιθόστρωτον, "the Pavement" (John xix., 13); when Sir John Cheke rendered ἑκατόνταρχος "hundreder" (Matt. viii., 5), σεληνιαζόμενος "mooned" (Matt. iv., 24). But the number of words which allow of this reproduction is comparatively small. Of many the etymology is lost; many others do not admit the formation of a corresponding word in another language. This scheme, therefore, whatever advantages it may possess, can of necessity be very sparingly applied.

Another method, then, is to choose some generic word, such as must needs exist in both languages, the *genus* of which the word to be rendered is the *species*, and, without attempting any closer correspondence, to employ this. Our translators have frequently taken this course; they have done so, rendering βάτος, κόρος, χοῖνιξ, σάτον, alike by "measure" (Luke xvi., 6, 7; Rev. vi., 6; Matt. xiii., 33), with no endeavors to mark in any of these places the capacity of the measure; δραχμή by "piece of silver" (Luke xv., 8), στατήρ by "piece of money" (Matt. xvii., 27), not attempting in either case to designate the value of the coin; ἀνθύπατος by "deputy" (Acts xiii., 8), στρατηγοί by "magistrates" (Acts xvi., 22), χιλίαρχος by "captain" (Rev. xix., 18), σικάριοι by "murderers" (Acts xxi., 38), μάγοι by "wise men" (Matt. ii., 1). A manifest disadvantage which attends this course is the want in

the copy of that definite distinctness which the original possessed, a certain vagueness which is given to the former, with the obliteration of all strongly marked lines.

Or, thirdly, they may seek out some special word in the language into which the translation is being made which shall be more or less an approximative equivalent for that in whose place it stands. We have two not very happy illustrations of this scheme in "town-clerk," as the rendering of γραμματεύς (Acts xix., 35), though doubtless the town-clerk in the sixteenth and seventeenth century was a very different and far more important personage than now;* and "Easter" as that of Πάσχα (Acts xii., 4). The turning of Ἑρμῆς into "Mercurius" (Acts xiv., 12) is, in fact, another example of the same, although our translators themselves, no doubt, were unconscious of it, seeing that in their time the essential distinction between the Greek and the Italian mythologies, and the fact that the names of the deities in the former were only adapted with more or less fitness to the deities of the latter, was unknown even to scholars.† This method of translating has its own serious drawback, that, although it often gives a distinct and vigorous, yet it runs the danger of conveying a more or less false, impression. Except by a very singular felicity, and one which will not often occur, the word selected, while it conveys some truth, must also convey some error bound up with the truth. Thus κοδράντης is not what we have rendered it, "a farthing" (Mark xii., 42), and ἀσσάριον (Matt. x., 29) as little;‡ nor δηνάριον "a penny" (Matt. xx., 2),

* T. G., the author of some *Notes and Observations upon some Passages of Scripture*, Oxford, 1646, p. 42, would substitute "actuary"—scarcely an improvement. He complains with justice (p. 45) that "a worshiper" is too feeble a rendering of νεωκόρος, Acts xix., 35, and would put "the sacrist" in its room; but, while much might be said in favor of "sacrist," Hammond also suggesting it, this is just that sort of word which our translators have every where sought to avoid.

† Curiously enough, Ἑρμῆς, one of the Roman Christians whom St. Paul salutes (Rom. xvi., 13), is also rendered "Mercurius" in Cranmer's and the Geneva Version.

‡ How far our words fail to express not merely the actual, but the relative

nor μετρητής "a firkin" (John ii., 6); not, I mean, our farthing, or penny, or firkin. So, too, if "piece of money" is a vague translation of δραχμή (Luke xv., 8), Wicliffe's "bezant" and Tyndale's "grote" involve absolute error. Add to this the danger that the coloring of one time and age may thus be substituted for that of another, of the modern world for the ancient, a tone heathen and profane for one sacred and Christian; as when Golding, in his translation of Ovid's *Metamorphosis*, calls the Vestal Virgins "nuns;" as when Holland, in his *Livy* and elsewhere, talks of "colonels," "wardens of the marches," renders constantly "Pontifex Maximus" by "archbishop," with much else of the like kind; and it will be seen that the inconveniences attending this course are not small.

There remains only one way more—to take the actual word of the original, and to transplant it unchanged, or at most with a slight change in the termination—"parce detortum" —into the other tongue, in the trust that time and use will, little by little, cause the strangeness of it to disappear, and its meaning gradually to be acquired even by the unlearned. Plutarch, in his Roman *Lives*, deals thus with many Latin words, as δικτάτωρ, φουρκίφερ, Καπετώλιον; so, too, our latest Greek historian, where others had spoken of "heavy-armed," of "targeteer," of "the *leadership* of Greece," has preferred "hoplite," "peltast," "the *hegemony* of Greece." Our translators have followed this course in respect of many Hebrew words in the Old Testament, as "Urim," "Thummim," "ephod," "shekel," "cherub," "seraphim," "cor," "bath," "ephah;" and of some Greek in the New, as "tetrarch," "proselyte," "Paradise," "Pentecost," "Messias;" or, by adopting these words from preceding translations, have acquiesced in the fitness of this course. At the same time they have felt the dan-

values of the Greek and Roman moneys for which they stand, may be seen in the fact that the ἀσσάριον is four times more valuable than the κοδράντης, both being translated "farthing;" and while our penny, farthing, mite, stand in the relation of 1, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{8}$, the δηνάριον, ἀσσάριον, and λεπτόν stand in that of 1, $\frac{1}{16}$, $\frac{1}{128}$.

ger of this scheme. We have no such word as "scenopegia" (in the Rheims Version, John vii., 2); nor have we stuffed our version with "metretes," "assarion," "lepton," "sata," "chœnix," "modius," "hemorrhage," and dozens more of the same kind, with which a recent translator, who designs his work as an "important contribution to practical religion," and also flatters himself that he has "adopted a thoroughly modern style," has stuffed his. The disadvantage of this course evidently is, that in many cases the adopted word continues always an exotic for the mass of the people: it never tells its own story to them, nor becomes, so to speak, transparent with its own meaning. And therefore, as I can not but think, the number of words of this kind which occur in Wicliffe's translation must have constituted a serious drawback to its popular character, while at the same time they testify strongly to the embarrassments which awaited the first breaker up of a new way. I refer to such words as "architriclyn" (John ii., 8), "prepucye" (Rom. ii., 25), "neomenye" (Col. ii., 16), "apocalips" (Rev. i., 1), "diluvye" (2 Pet. ii., 5), and the like.

It is impossible to adhere with a strict consistency to any one of these devices for representing the things of one condition of society by the words of another; they must all in their turn be appealed to, even as they all will be found barely sufficient. Our translators have employed them all. Their inclination, as compared with others, is perhaps toward the second, the least ambitious, but at the same time the safest, of these courses. Once or twice they have chosen it when one of the other ways appears manifestly preferable, as in their rendering of ἀνθύπατος by "deputy" (Acts xiii., 7, 8, 12), "proconsul" being ready made to their hands, with Wicliffe's authority for its use.

There is another question, doubtless a perplexing one, which our translators had to solve; I confess that I much regret the solution at which they arrived. It was this. How should they deal with the Hebrew names of places and

of persons in the Old Testament which had gradually assumed a form somewhat different from their original on the lips of Greek-speaking Jews, and which appeared in these their later Hellenistic forms in the New Testament. Should they bring them back to their original shapes, or suffer them to stand in their later deflections? Thus, meeting Ἠλίας in the Greek text, should they render it "Elias" or "Elijah?" We all know the answer which for the most part they gave to this question; but I am not the less deeply convinced that, for the purpose of keeping vivid and strong the relations between the Old and New Testament in the minds of the great body of English hearers and readers of Scripture, they ought to have recurred to the Old Testament names, which are not merely the Hebrew, but also the English names, and which, therefore, had their right to a place in the English text; that Ἠλίας, for instance, should have been translated into that which is not merely its Hebrew, but also its English equivalent, "Elijah," and so with the others. They *have* acted so in respect of "Jerusalem;" and, because they found Ἱεροσόλυμα very often in their Greek text, they did not, therefore, think it necessary to write "Hierosolyma." To measure how much we lose by the scheme which they have preferred, let us just seek to realize to ourselves the difference in the amount of awakened attention among a country congregation which Matt. xvii., 10 would arouse if it were read thus, "And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the Scribes that *Elijah* must first come?" as compared with what it now is likely to create. Elijah is a person to them; the same who once raised the widow's son, who on Mount Carmel challenged and overcame alone the army of the prophets of Baal, who went up in a fire-chariot to heaven. Elias is for them but a name.

As it is, we have a double nomenclature, and for the unlearned members of the Church a sufficiently perplexing one, for very many places and persons of the earlier Covenant. It would be curious to know how many of our people recog-

nize the widow of "Zarephath" (1 Kings xvii., 9) in the woman of "Sarepta," spoken of by our Lord in the synagogue of Nazareth (Luke iv., 26). And then what confusion in respect of kings, and prophets, and others, many of them familiar enough if they had presented themselves in their own forms, but strange and unrecognized in their Hellenistic disguise! Not to speak of "Elijah" and "Elias," we have "Elisha" and "Eliseus" (Luke iv., 26); "Hosea" and "Osee" (Rom. ix., 25); "Isaiah" and "Esaias" (Matt. iii., 3); to which the Apocrypha adds a third form, "Esay" (Ecclus. xlviii., 22); "Uzziah" and "Ozias" (Matt. i., 9); "Abijah" and "Abia" (Matt. i., 7); "Kish" and "Cis" (Acts xiii., 21); "Hezekiah" and "Ezekias" (Matt. i., 10); "Terah" and "Thara" (Luke iii., 34); "Zechariah" and "Zacharias" (Matt. xxiii., 35); "Korah" and "Core" (this last commonly pronounced as a monosyllable in our national schools), "Rahab" and "Rachab," "Peleg" and "Phaleg," and (most unfortunate of all) "Joshua" and "Jesus."

It is, indeed, hardly possible to exaggerate the confusion of which the "Jesus" of Heb. iv., 8 must be the occasion to the great body of unlearned English readers and hearers, not to speak of a slight perplexity arising from the same cause at Acts vii., 45. The fourth chapter of the Hebrews is anyhow hard enough; it is only with strained attention that we follow the apostle's argument. But when to its own difficulty is added for many the confusion arising from the fact that "Jesus" is here used, not of him whose name is above every name, but of the son of Nun, known every where in the Old Testament by the name of "Joshua," the perplexity to many becomes hopeless. It is in vain that our translators have added in the margin, "that is, Joshua;" for all practical purposes of excluding misconception, the note, in most of our Bibles omitted, is useless. In putting "Jesus" here they have departed from most of our preceding versions, and from many foreign. Even if they had counted that the letter of their obligation as translators, which yet I can not think, bound them to this, one would willingly have here seen a

breach of the letter, that so they might better have kept the spirit.

There is another difficulty, entailing, however, no such serious consequences, even if the best way of meeting it is not chosen: how, namely, to deal with Greek and Latin proper names? whether to make them in their terminations English, or to leave them as we find them? Our translators in this matter adhere to no constant rule. It is not merely that some proper names drop their classical terminations, as "Paul," and "Saul," and "Urban" (Rom. xvi., 9),* while others, as "Silvanus," which by the same rule should be "Silvan," and "Mercurius," retain it. This inconsistency is prevalent in all books which have to do with classical antiquity. There is almost no Roman history in which "Pompey" and "Antony" do not stand side by side with "Augustus" and "Tiberius." Merivale's, who also writes "Pompeius" and "Antonius," is almost the only exception which I know. If this were all, there would be little to find fault with in an irregularity almost, if not quite, universal, and in some cases hardly to be avoided without so much violence done to usage as might leave it doubtful whether the gain exceeded the loss.† But in our version the same name occurs with a Greek or Latin ending, now with an English, as though it were now "Pompeius" and now "Pompey," now "Antonius" and now "Antony," in the same volume, or even the same page, of some Roman history; and the fault extends to Hebrew names as well. Consistency in such details is avowedly difficult, and the difficulty of attaining it must have been much enhanced by the many hands that were engaged in our version. But it is strange that not only in different parts of the New Testament, which proceeded from different

* So it ought to be printed in our modern Bibles, not "Urbane," which is now deceptive, though it was not so according to the orthography of 1611; it suggests a trisyllable, and the termination of a female name. It is Οὐρβανόν in the original.

† See an article with the title *Orthographic Mutineers*, in the *Miscellaneous Essays* of De Quincey.

hands,* we have now "Marcus" (Col. iv., 10; Philem. 24; 1 Pet. v., 13) and now "Mark" (Acts xii., 12, 25; 2 Tim. iv., 11); now "Lucas" (postscript to 2 Cor.) and now "Luke" (2 Tim. iv., 11); now "Jeremias" (Matt. xvi., 14) and now "Jeremy" (Matt. ii., 17); now "Apollos" (Acts xviii., 24; xix., 1), now "Apollo"† (1 Cor. iii., 22; iv., 6); now "Noë" (Matt. xxiv., 38) and now "Noah" (1 Pet. iii., 20); now "Simon, son of Jonas" (John xxi., 15, 16, 17), and now "Simon, son of Jona" (John i., 42); now "Judas" (Matt. i., 2) and now "Juda" (Luke iii., 33; Heb. vii., 14): this in respect of the patriarch of this name, while the apostle is now "Judas" (Acts i., 13) and now "Jude" (Jude 1); now "Timotheus" (Acts xvi., 1) and now "Timothy" (Heb. xiii., 21); but in the same chapter we have Τιμόθεος rendered first "Timothy" (2 Cor. i., 1) and then "Timotheus" (*ib.*, ver. 19). In like manner we have "Corinthus" in one place (postscript to the Ep. to the Romans) and "Corinth" elsewhere; "Sodoma" (Rom. ix., 29) and "Sodom" (Matt. x., 15; Jude 7); while the inhabitants of Crete (Κρῆτες) are now "Cretes" (Acts ii., 11), which can not be right, and now "Cretians" (Tit. i., 12); "Cretans" is a form preferable to both.

There are other inconsistencies in the manner of dealing with proper names. Thus Ἄρειος πάγος is "Areopagus" at Acts xvii., 19, while three verses farther on it is "Mars Hill." In which of these ways it ought to have been translated may very fairly be a question; the subsequent mention of "Dionysius the *Areopagite*" (ver. 34) may perhaps give a preference to the former rendering; but one rendering or the other, once chosen, should have been adhered to. Then, again, if our translators gave, as they properly did, the Latin termination to the names of cities, "Ephes*us*," "Milet*us*," not "Ephesos," "Miletos," they should have done this through-

* In the same way it is "Tyrus" throughout Jeremiah (xxvi., 2), and "Tyre" throughout Isaiah (xxiii., 5).

† This latter form, manifestly inconvenient, as confounding the name of an eminent Christian teacher with that of a heathen deity, has been, as already remarked, tacitly removed from later editions of our Bible.

out, and written "Ass*us*" (Acts xx., 13, 14) and "Pergam*us*" (Rev. i., 11; ii., 12), not "Assos" and "Pergamos." In regard of this last, it would have been better still if they had employed the form "Pergam*um*;" for, while no doubt there are examples of the feminine Πέργαμος in Greek authors,* they are excessively rare, and the city's name is almost always written Πέργαμον in Greek, and "Pergamum" in Latin.† A singular error, exactly reversing this one, the use of "Mile*tum*" at 2 Tim. iv., 20, has been often noted; an error into which our translators would probably not have fallen themselves, but have inherited it from the versions preceding, all which have it. Yet it is strange that they did not correct it here, seeing that it, or a similar error, "Mileto*n*," had, at Acts xx., 15, 17, been by them discovered and removed, and the city's name rightly given, "Miletus;" although in the heading even of this chapter also they have suffered "Miletum" to stand.‡

It is the carrying of one rule through which we desire in these matters, and this is not seldom exactly what we miss. Thus, seeing that in the enumeration of the precious stones which constitute the foundations of the New Jerusalem (Rev. xxi., 19, 20), all save two, which are capable of receiving an

* Ptol., v. ii.; comp. Lobeck, *Phrynichus*, p. 422.

† Xenophon, *Anab.*, vii., 8, 8; Strabo, xiii., 4; Pliny, *H. N.*, xxxv., 46.

‡ At the same time, it is very possible that "Miletum" was originally no error. In early English, as very often in German at the present day, Latin and Greek words are declined, and given the termination of that case in which they would appear, supposing the whole sentence to have been composed in one of these languages. Thus, in Wicliffe's Version (Rom. xvi., 12), "Greete well Trifen*am* and Trifos*am*." Again, in the Geneva (Acts xxvii., 7), "We scarce were come over against Gnid*um*;" in Tyndale (Acts ix., 3), "desired of him letters to Damasc*o*." So, too, in Capgrave's *Chronicle*, p. 85: "He held the grete Councille of Chalcidony ageyn Eutic*em* the heretik." Nor has this usage wholly passed away. In Kingsley's very noble poem of *Perseus and Andromeda*, they appear, once at least, as "Pers*ea*" and "Andromed*en*." I can not, however, think that this allowing the proper names which we use to assert the rights of their own grammar against those of the English has any such merits that it should be reintroduced among us. In an English sentence they must learn to accommodate themselves to English ways.

English termination, do receive it — thus, "beryl" and not "beryllus," "chrysolite"* and not "chrysolithus," "jacinth" and not "jacinthus" — we might fairly ask that these two, "chrysoprasus" and "sardius," should not be exceptionally treated. It should therefore be "chrysoprase," and not "chrysoprasus." "Sardius" may be objected to for a farther reason. Σάρδιον, not σάρδιος, is the Greek name of this stone, as "sarda" is the Latin; and σάρδιος here is an adjective (*sardius* lapis, Tertullian), quite as much as σάρδινος at Rev. iv., 3, λίθος, which is there expressed, being here understood. It would have been, therefore, more correct to translate "a sardine stone" here, as has been done there. Two other ways, indeed, lay before our translators. "Sard" has been naturalized in English; it is used in Holland's *Pliny;* and they might have adopted this; or, best of all, as it seems to me, they might have boldly ventured upon "ruby," which in all likelihood this stone was, and which otherwise we miss in the present enumeration of precious stones, though it is very unlikely that a stone so prized should be absent here. "Sardius," which they *have* employed, seems anyhow incorrect, though the Vulgate may be quoted in its favor.

Hammond affirms, and I must needs consider with reason, that "Tres Tabernæ" should have been left in its Latin form (Acts xxviii., 15), and not rendered "The Three Taverns." It is a proper name, just as much as "Appii Forum," which occurs in the same verse, and which rightly we have not resolved into "The Market of Appius." Had we left "Tres Tabernæ" untouched (I observe De Wette does so), we should then have only dealt as the sacred historian has himself dealt with it, who has merely written it in Greek letters, not turned it into equivalent Greek words. As little should we have turned it into English.

Sometimes our translators have carried too far, as I can not but think, the turning of qualitative genitives into adjec-

* Misspelt "chrysol*y*te," and the etymology obscured, in nearly all our modern editions, but correctly given in the exemplar edition of 1611.

tives. Oftentimes it is prudently done, and with a due recognition of the Hebrew idiom which has moulded and modified the Greek phrase with which they have to deal. Thus "forgetful hearer" is unquestionably better than "hearer of forgetfulness" (James i., 25); "his natural face" than "face of his nature" or "of his generation" (*ib.*); "unjust steward" than "steward of injustice" (Luke xvi., 8). Yet at other times they have done this without necessity, and occasionally with manifest loss. "Deceitful lusts" is a very unsatisfactory substitute for "lusts of deceit" (Eph. iv., 22). "Son of his love," which the Rheims Version has, would have been better than "beloved son"* (Col. i., 13); "the Gospel of the glory" than "the glorious Gospel" (1 Tim. i., 11); and certainly "the body of our vileness," or "of our humiliation," better than "our vile body;" "the body of his glory" than "his glorious body" (Phil. iii., 21). "The uncertainty of riches," as it is in the Rheims, would be more accurate than "uncertain riches" (1 Tim. vi., 17); "appearing of the glory," as in the Geneva, than "glorious appearing" (Tit. ii., 13); "children of the curse" than "cursed children" (2 Pet. ii., 14); in which last case it has been forgotten that there was a second Hebraism, that, namely, inherent in "children," to deal with.† Οἰκονομία Θεοῦ can never mean "godly edifying" (1 Tim. i., 4). "The glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom. viii., 21) not merely comes short of, but expresses something very different from, "the liberty of the glory of the children of God" (see Alford, *in loco*). Doubtless the accumulated genitives are in this last place awkward to deal with: it was probably to avoid them that the translation assumed its present shape; but still, when higher interests are at stake, such awkwardness must be endured, and elsewhere our translators have not shrunk from it, as at Rev. xvi., 19: "The cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath."

* Augustine (*De Trin.*, xv., 19) lays a dogmatic stress on the genitive ("Filius caritatis ejus nullus est alius, quam qui de substantiâ Ejus est genitus"), but this may be questioned.

† See some good observations on this phrase in Scholefield's *Hints*, *in loco*, p. 159.

Calvary is a word so consecrated for us that one is almost unwilling to urge that it has no right to a place in our Bibles; and yet it certainly has none, and we owe to the Vulgate, or rather to the influence of Latin Christianity, that we find it there: "When they were come to the place which is called *Calvary*, there they crucified him" (Luke xxiii., 33). But this Κρανίον ought either to be dealt with as a proper name, in which case "Cranium" would be the right rendering, or else translated, in which case "A Skull," not "the place of a skull," as in the margin here, this being drawn from Matt. xxvii., 33. In no case can recourse be had rightly to the Latin; or a Latin name, and one which did not, as applied to this place, exist till many centuries after, be properly employed. The same reasons which made "Calvaria" (being the name for a skull in the silver age of Latinity) appropriate in the Latin translation, make "Calvary" inappropriate in ours. At the same time, I would much rather lie under the charge of inconsequence than suggest that it should be now disturbed.

## CHAPTER V.

### ON SOME UNNECESSARY DISTINCTIONS INTRODUCED.

It may be well, before entering on this subject, to make one remark, which, having an especial reference to the subject-matter of this and the following chapter, more or less bears upon all. I have already observed that the advantages were great of coming, as our translators did, in the rear of other translators; of inheriting from those who went before them so large an amount of work well done, of successful renderings, of phrases consecrated already by long usage in the Church. It was a signal gain that they had not, in the fabric which they were constructing, to make a new framework throughout, but needed only here and there to insert new materials where the old from any cause were faulty or out of date; that of them it was not demanded that they should make a translation where none existed before; nor yet, as they have remarked themselves, that they should bring a good translation out of bad or indifferent ones; but only a best, and that out of many good ones preceding. None who have ever been engaged in the task of transferring from one language to another but will freely acknowledge that in this their gain was most real, and they well understood how to turn these advantages to account.

Yet, vast as these doubtless were, they were not without certain accompanying drawbacks. He who revises, above all when he addresses himself to the task of revision with a confidence, here abundantly justified, in the general excellency of that which he is revising, is in constant danger of allowing his vigilance to sleep, and of thus passing over errors which he would not himself have originated had he been thrown altogether on his own resources. I can not but think

that in this way the watchfulness of our translators, or revisers rather, has been sometimes remitted, and that errors and inconsistencies which they would not themselves have introduced, they have yet passed by and allowed. A large proportion of the faults in our translation are thus an inheritance from former versions. This is not, indeed, any excuse; for they who, with full power to remove, passed them by, became responsible for them; but is merely mentioned as the probable explanation of many among them. With this much of introduction, I will pass on to the proper subject of this chapter.

Our translators sometimes create distinctions which have no counterparts in their original by using two or more words to render at different places, or, it may be, at the same place, a single word in the Greek text.*

After what has been urged in a preceding chapter, it will be readily understood that we by no means make a general complaint against them that they have varied their words when there is no variation in the original. Oftentimes this was inevitable, or, if not inevitable, was certainly the more excellent way. What we do complain of is that they have done this where it was wholly gratuitous, and sometimes where the force, clearness, and precision of the original have consequently suffered not a little. It is true that what they did here they did more or less with their eyes open, and not altogether of oversight; and it will be only fair to hear what they, in an *Address to the Reader*, now seldom or never reprinted, but, on many accounts, well worthy of being so,† say

* Hugh Broughton has some good remarks on this subject, *Works*, 1662, p. 702.

† Their "pedantic and uncouth preface" Symonds calls it. There would certainly be pedantry in any one now writing with such richness and fullness of learned allusion, a pedantry from which our comparatively scanty stores of classical and ecclesiastical learning would in most cases effectually preserve us. But this preface is, on many grounds, a most interesting study, chiefly, indeed, as giving at considerable length, and in various aspects, the view of our translators themselves in regard of the work which they had undertaken; while, "uncouth" as this objector calls it, every true knower of our language

upon this matter, and how they defend the course which they have adopted. These are their words: "Another thing we think good to admonish thee of (gentle reader), that we have not tied ourselves to a uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words, as some peradventure would wish that we had done, because they observe that some learned men some-

will acknowledge it a masterpiece of English composition. Certainly it would not be easy to find a more beautiful or more affecting piece of writing than the twenty or thirty lines with which the fourth paragraph, "*On the praise of the Holy Scriptures*," concludes. And this much I will quote of it for its own sake, and in the hope that I may thus assist a little in drawing this preface from the obscurity and forgetfulness into which it has been so strangely allowed to fall: "Men talk much of εἰρεσιώνη, how many sweet and goodly things it had hanging on it; of the Philosopher's stone, that it turneth copper into gold; of Cornu-copia, that it had all things necessary for food in it; of Panaces the herb, that it was good for all diseases; of Catholicon the drug, that it is instead of all purges; of Vulcan's Armor, that it was an armor of proof against all thrusts, and all blows, etc. Well, that which they falsely or vainly attributed to these things for bodily good, we may justly and with full measure ascribe unto the Scripture for spiritual. It is not only an armor, but also a whole armory of weapons, both offensive and defensive, whereby we may save ourselves and put the enemy to flight. It is not an herb, but a tree, or rather a whole paradise of trees of life, which bring forth fruit every month, and the fruit thereof is for meat, and the leaves for medicine. It is not a pot of manna or a cruse of oil, which were for memory only, or for a meal's meat or two, but as it were a shower of heavenly bread sufficient for a whole host, be it never so great, and as it were a whole cellar full of oil-vessels, whereby all our necessities may be provided for, and our debts discharged. In a word, it is a Panary of wholesome food against fenowed traditions; a Physician's shop (St. Basil calleth it) of preservatives against poisoned heresies; a Pandect of profitable laws against rebellious spirits; a treasure of most costly jewels against beggarly rudiments; finally, a fountain of most pure water springing up unto everlasting life. And what marvel? the original thereof being from heaven, not from earth; the Author being GOD, not man; the Enditer, the Holy Spirit, not the wit of the apostles or prophets; the penmen such as were sanctified from the womb, and endued with a principal portion of GOD's Spirit; the matter, verity, piety, purity, uprightness; the form, GOD's Word, GOD's testimony, GOD's oracles, the word of truth, the word of salvation, etc.; the effects, light of understanding, stableness of persuasion, repentance from dead works, newness of life, holiness, peace, joy in the Holy Ghost; lastly, the end and reward of the study thereof, fellowship with the saints, participation of the heavenly nature, fruition of an inheritance immortal, undefiled, and that never shall fade away: Happy is the man that delighteth in the Scripture, and thrice happy that meditateth in it day and night."

where have been as exact as they could that way. Truly, that we might not vary from the sense of that which we had translated before, if the word signified the same in both places (for there be some words be not of the same sense every where), we were especially careful, and made a conscience according to our duty. But that we should express the same notion in the same particular word; as, for example, if we translate the Hebrew or Greek word once by *purpose*, never to call it *intent;* if one where *journeying*, never *traveling;* if one where *think*, never *suppose;* if one where *pain*, never *ache;* if one where *joy*, never *gladness*, etc., thus to mince the matter, we thought to savor more of curiosity than wisdom, and that rather it would breed scorn in the atheist than bring profit to the godly reader. For is the kingdom of God become words or syllables? why should we be in bondage to them if we may be free; use one precisely, when we may use another no less fit as commodiously? We might also be charged (by scoffers) with some unequal dealing toward a great number of good English words. For as it is written of a certain great philosopher that he should say that those logs were happy that were made images to be worshiped; for their fellows, as good as they, lay for blocks behind the fire; so if we should say, as it were, unto certain words, Stand up higher; have a place in the Bible always; and to others of like quality, Get ye hence; be banished forever; we might be taxed peradventure with St. James's words, namely, 'To be partial in ourselves and judges of evil thoughts.'"

Such is their explanation—to me, I confess, an insufficient one, whatever ingenuity may be ascribed to it; and for these reasons insufficient. It is clearly the office of translators to put the reader of the translation, as nearly as may be, on the same vantage-ground as the reader of the original; to give him, so far as this is attainable, the same assistances for understanding his author's meaning. Now every exact and laborious student of the Greek Testament knows that there is almost no such help in some passage of difficulty, doctrinal

or other, as to turn to his Greek Concordance, to search out every other passage in which the word or words wherein the difficulty seems chiefly to reside, occur, and closely to observe their usage there. It is manifestly desirable that the reader of the English Bible should have, as nearly as possible, the same resource. But if, where there is one and the same word in the original, there are two, three, half a dozen in the version, he is in the main deprived of it. Thus he hears the doctrine of the atonement discussed; he would fain turn to all the passages where "atonement" occurs; he finds only one (Rom. v., 11), and, of course, is unaware that in other passages where he meets "reconciling" and "reconciliation" (Rom. xi., 15; 2 Cor. v., 18, 19) it is the same word in the original. In words like this, which are, so to speak, *sedes doctrinæ*, one regrets, above all, variation and uncertainty in rendering.

I confess that I would fain see more even than this—not merely that each word in one language should have its fixed and recognized equivalent in the other, not to be exchanged for any other unless on the clearest necessity and in exceptional cases; but it would be further desirable that where words had budded, and other words grown out of them—κυριότης, for example, out of κύριος—in such a case, if κύριος had been rendered "lord," then κυριότης should be "lordship," and not "dominion;" that if δίκαιος is "righteous," δικαιοσύνη shall be "righteousness"—if, on the other hand, δίκαιος is "just," then let δικαιοσύνη be "justice;" that, in fact, not merely word should answer word, but family should correspond to family. It is much, indeed, that we here demand, and we only demand it as an ideal toward which the nearest attainable approach should be made, being, as it is, probably far more than *any* language could render, certainly far more than our own. A circumstance which, in many aspects, constitutes our riches, namely, that the English language has two factors, a Pelasgic and a Gothic, and that thus we have often duplicate words where other languages—the German, for example—have but a single one, as "just" and "justice" side by side

with "righteous" and "righteousness," or, still more remarkably, "saint," "saintly," "sanctify," "sanctification," "sanctity," over against "holy one," "holy," "hallow," "hallowing," "holiness:" this circumstance, in some of the consequences which have followed from it, works often injuriously so far as the fulfilling our present demand is concerned. The consequences I refer to are these, namely, that, as continually will happen, neither group is complete, some words having dropped out from each, and only between them and by their joint contributions the whole body of needful words is made up. For instance, our translators use often "righteous" for δίκαιος, and always, I believe, "righteousness" for δικαιοσύνη. But they have presently to deal with δικαιόω and δικαίωσις. There are gaps here in our Saxon group; no help to be found in that quarter—no choice, therefore, but to take up with the Latin, "to justify," and "justification," and this, moreover, with the certainty that the etymology of "justificare," the word which they were compelled to use ("justum *facere*"), would be turned against that truth which they most loved to assert, and which δικαιοῦν did itself so plainly declare. Then, too, while πίστις is "faith," and πιστός "faithful," when we reach πιστεύειν there is no proceeding further in this line: we betake ourselves perforce to "believe," a word excellent in itself, but with the serious drawback that it belongs to quite another family, and stands in no connection with "faith" and "faithful" at all. Observe, for example, how through this the loop and link connecting the great eleventh chapter of the Hebrews with the last verse of the chapter preceding has been dropped in our version, and the most natural transition obscured.

But, without pressing this farther, and returning to the main proposition of this chapter, which is, that a Greek word should have, so far as possible, its fixed and unchanged representative in English, the losses which ensue from the neglect or the non-recognition of this rule may be shown to be considerable. Thus it will sometimes happen that when St.

Paul is pursuing a close train of reasoning, and one which demands severest attention, the difficulties of his argument, not small in themselves, are aggravated by the use on the translators' part of different words where he has used the same, the word being sometimes the very key to the whole argument. It is thus in the fourth chapter of the Romans. Λογίζομαι occurs eleven times in this chapter. We may say that it is the key-word to St. Paul's argument throughout, being every where employed most strictly in the same, and that a technical and theological, sense. But our translators have no fixed rule of rendering it. Twice they render it "count" (ver. 3, 5); six times "impute" (ver. 6, 8, 11, 22, 23, 24); and three times "reckon" (ver. 4, 9, 10); while at Gal. iii., 6 they introduce a fourth rendering, "account." Let the student read this chapter, employing every where "reckon," or, which would be better, every where "impute," and observe how much of clearness and precision St. Paul's argument would in this way acquire.

In other places no doctrine is in danger of being obscured, but still the change is uncalled for and sometimes perplexing. Thus what confusion arises from turning ἄβυσσος, which in the Revelation is always translated "the bottomless pit" (ix., 1, 2, 11, and often), into "the deep" (Luke viii., 31); above all, when this "deep," which it needs not to say is the φυλακή —that forlorn province of the Hades-world which is the receptacle of lost spirits—is so liable, as it is here, to be confounded with "the lake" ("the sea," Matt. viii., 32), mentioned immediately after.

Or in other ways the variation is injurious. Take, for instance, Rev. iv., 4: "And round about the *throne* (θρόνου) were four-and-twenty *seats*" (θρόνοι). It is easy to see the motive of this variation; and yet, if the inspired apostle was visited with no misgivings lest the creature should seem to be encroaching on the dignity of the Creator, and it is clear that he was not—on the contrary, he has, in the most marked manner, brought the *throne* of God and the *thrones* of the

elders together—certainly the translators need not have been more careful than he had been, nor made the elders to sit on "seats," and only God on a "throne." This august company of the four-and-twenty elders represents the Church of the Old and the New Testament, each in its twelve heads; but how much is lost by turning their "thrones" into "seats;" for example, the connection of this Scripture with Matt. xix., 28, and with all the promises that Christ's servants should not merely see his glory, but share it, that they should be *σύνθρονοι* with him (Rev. iii., 21), this little change obscuring the truth that they are here set before us as *συμβασιλεύοντες* (1 Cor. iv., 8; 2 Tim. ii., 12), as kings reigning with him. This truth is saved, indeed, by the mention of the golden crowns on their heads, but is implied also in their sitting, as they do in the Greek, but not in the English, on seats of equal dignity with his, on "thrones." The same scruple which dictated this change makes itself felt through the whole translation of the Apocalypse, and to a manifest loss. In that book is set forth, as nowhere else in Scripture, the hellish parody of the heavenly kingdom; the conflict between the true King of the earth and the usurping king; the loss, therefore, is evident when for "Satan's *throne*" is substituted "Satan's *seat*" (ii., 13); for "the *throne* of the beast," "the *seat* of the beast" (xvi. 10).

A great master of language will often implicitly refer in some word which he uses to the same word, or, it may be, to another of the same group or family, which he or some one else has just used before; and where there is evidently intended such an allusion, it should, wherever this is possible, be reproduced in the translation. There are two examples of this in St. Paul's discourse at Athens, both of which have been effaced in our version. Of those who encountered Paul in the market at Athens, some said, "He seemeth to be *a setter forth* of strange gods" (Acts xvii., 18). They use the word *καταγγελεύς*; and he, remembering and taking up this word, retorts it upon them: "Whom, therefore, ye ignorant-

ly worship, him *declare I* unto you" (ver. 23); so our translators; but better, "Him *set I forth* (καταγγέλλω) unto you." He has their charge present in his mind, and this is his answer to their charge. It would more plainly appear such to the English reader if the translators, having used "setter forth" before, had thus returned upon the word, instead of substituting, as they have done, "declare" for it. The Rheims Version, which has "preacher" and "preach," after "annuntiator" and "annuntio" of the Vulgate, has been careful to retain and indicate the connection.

But the finer and more delicate turns of the divine rhetoric of St. Paul are more seriously affected by another oversight in the same verse. We make him there say, "As I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, To the *Unknown* God (ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ). Whom, therefore, ye *ignorantly* (ἀγνοοῦντες) worship, him declare I unto you." But if any thing is clear, it is that St. Paul in ἀγνοοῦντες intends to take up the preceding ἀγνώστῳ; the chime of the words, and also, probably, the fact of their etymological connection, leading him to this. He has spoken of their altar to an "*Unknown* God," and he proceeds, "whom, therefore, ye worship *unknowing*, him declare I unto you." "Ignorantly" has the further objection that it conveys more of rebuke than St. Paul, who is sparing his hearers to the uttermost, intended.

In other passages, also, the point of a sentence lies in the recurrence and repetition of the same word, which yet they have failed to repeat, as in these which follow:

1 Cor. iii., 17.—"If any man *defile* (φθείρει) the temple of God, him shall God *destroy* (φθερεῖ)." It is the fearful law of retaliation which is here proclaimed. He who *ruins* shall himself be *ruined* in turn. It shall be done to him as he has done to the temple of God. Undoubtedly it is hard to get the right word which will suit in both places. "Corrupt" is the first which suggests itself; yet it would not do to say, "If any man *corrupt* the temple of God, him shall God *cor-*

*rupt.*" The difficulty which our translators felt, it is evident that the Vulgate felt the same, which in like manner has changed its word: "Si quis autem templum Dei *violaverit*, *disperdet* illum Deus." Yet why should not the verse be rendered, "If any man *destroy* the temple of God, him shall God *destroy?*"

Matt. xxi., 41.—"He will *miserably* destroy those *wicked* men." A difficulty of exactly the same kind exists here, where yet the κακοὺς κακῶς of the original ought, in some way or other, to have been preserved, as in this way it might very sufficiently be: "He will *miserably* destroy those *miserable* men;" their doom shall correspond to their condition; as this is, so shall be that. Neither would it have been hard at 2 Thess. i., 6, to retain the play upon words, and to have rendered τοῖς θλίβουσιν ὑμᾶς θλῖψιν, "*affliction* to them that *afflict* you," instead of "*tribulation* to them that *trouble* you," there being no connection in English between the words "tribulation" and "trouble," though some likeness in sound; while yet the very purpose of the passage is to show that what wicked men have measured to others shall be measured to them again.

Let me indicate other examples of the same kind where the loss is manifest. Who can doubt that the ἱκάνωσεν of 2 Cor. iii., 6 is an echo of ἱκανοί and ἱκανότης of the verse preceding? With the assistance of "able" and "ability," or "ableness," as Tyndale has it, or else with "sufficient" and "sufficiency," it would have been easy to let this echo be heard in the English no less than in the Greek. Again, if at Gal. iii., 22, συνέκλεισεν is translated "hath concluded," συγκλειόμενοι in the next verse, which takes it up, should not be rendered "shut up." The Vulgate has well "conclusit" and "conclusi." Let the reader substitute "hath shut up" for "hath concluded" in ver. 22, and then read the passage. He will be at once aware of the gain. In like manner, let him take Rom. vii., 7, and read, "I had not known *lust* (ἐπιθυμίαν) except the law had said, Thou shalt not *lust* (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις);"

or Phil. ii., 13, "It is God which *worketh* (ὁ ἐνεργῶν) in you both to will and *to work* (τὸ ἐνεργεῖν)," and the passages will come out with a strength and clearness which they have not now. Not otherwise, if at 2 Thess. ii., 6, τὸ κατέχον is rendered "what *withholdeth*," ὁ κατέχων, in the verse following, should not be "he who *letteth*." While, undoubtedly, there is significance in the impersonal τὸ κατέχον exchanged for the personal ὁ κατέχων, there can be no doubt that they refer to one and the same person or institution; but this is obscured by the change of word. In like manner, one would have gladly seen the connection between λειπόμενοι and λείπεται at Jam. i., 4, 5, reproduced in our version. "Lacking" and "lack," which our previous versions had, would have done it. The "patience and *comfort* of the Scriptures" (Rom. xv., 4) is derived from "the God of patience and *comfort*" (ver. 5); for so one willingly would have read it; and not "consolation," as it now in this latter verse stands, causing a slight obscuration of the connection between the "comfort" and God, the Author of the "comfort." Our version at 2 Cor. i., 3–7 veers in the same way needlessly backward and forward, rendering παράκλησις four times by "consolation," and twice by "comfort."

How many readers have read in the English the third chapter of St. John, and missed the remarkable connection between our Lord's words at ver. 11, and the Baptist's taking up of those words at ver. 32; and this because μαρτυρία is translated "witness" on the former occasion, and "testimony" on the latter. Why, again, we may ask, should ὕβρις καὶ ζημία be "hurt and damage" at Acts xxvii., 10, and "harm and loss" at their recurrence, ver. 21? Both versions are good, and it would not much import which had been selected; but whichever had been employed on the first occasion ought also to have been employed on the second. St. Paul, repeating in the midst of the danger the very words which he had used when counseling his fellow voyagers how they might avoid that danger, would remind them, that so he

might obtain a readier hearing now, of that neglected warning of his, which the sequel had only justified too well.

Of these and some other examples in the like kind which I shall offer before leaving this part of the subject, some are so little significant that they might well be passed by, if any thing could be counted wholly insignificant which helps or hinders ever so little the more exact setting forth of the Word of God. Thus, if in the parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard (Matt. xx., 1), *οἰκοδεσπότης* is "householder" at ver. 1, it should scarcely be "goodman of the house" at ver. 11.* As little should the "*governor* of the feast" of John ii., 8, be the "*ruler* of the feast" in the very next verse; or the "goodly apparel" of James ii., 2, be the "gay clothing" of the verse following, the words of the original in each case remaining unchanged. Then why should not *λάμπει* and *λαμψάτω* (Matt. v., 15, 16) reappear in our version in the intimate relation wherein the Lord evidently means them to stand? Seeing, too, that he is especially urging the *mercy* which they who have found mercy are bound in return to show, that here is the very point of the reproach which the king addresses to the unmerciful servant (Matt. xviii., 33), *ἐλεεῖν* ought either to have been translated "have *pity*" or else "have *compassion*" in both clauses of the verse, but not first by one phrase, then by the other.

Again, it would have been clearly desirable that where in two, sometimes it is in three, Gospels exactly the same words,

* Scholefield (*Hints*, p. 8) further objects to this last rendering as having "a quaintness in it not calculated to recommend it." But it had nothing of the kind at the time our translation was made. Compare Spenser, *Faëry Queen*, iv., 5, 34:

> "There entering in, they found the *goodman* self
> Full busily upon his work ybent."

And still more to the point, in Holland's *Plutarch*, p. 200: "Finding by good fortune *the good man of the house* within, [he] asked for bread and water." So in Golding's *Ovid*, b. i.:

> "The *goodman* seeks the goodwive's death;"

this last quotation showing how entirely all ethical sense had departed from the word, as now from the French "bonhomme."

recording the same event or the same conversation, occur in the original, the identity should have been expressed by the use of exactly the same words in the English. This continually is not the case. Thus, Matt. xxvi., 41, and Mark xiv., 38, exactly correspond in the Greek, while in the translation the words appear in St. Matthew: "Watch and pray, *that* ye enter *not* into temptation; the spirit *indeed* is *willing*, but the flesh is weak;" in St. Mark: "Watch *ye* and pray, *lest* ye enter into temptation; the spirit *truly* is *ready*, but the flesh is weak." Again, the words Matt. xix., 20, and Mark x., 20, exactly agree in the original; they are far from doing so in our version: in St. Matthew: "All these *things* have I *kept* from my youth *up*;" in St. Mark: "All these have I *observed* from my youth." So, too, "Thy faith hath *saved* thee," of Luke vii., 50, represents exactly the same words as "Thy faith hath *made thee whole*" of Luke xvii., 19: and compare Matt. xx., 16 with xxii., 14.

It may seem a mere trifle that ζώνη δερματίνη is "a leathern girdle" in St. Matthew (iii., 4), and "a girdle of a skin" in the parallel passage of St. Mark (i., 6); yet, not to urge the purely gratuitous character of this and similar variations, it must not be forgotten that through them a most interesting question, opening into boundless fields of inquiry, namely, the exact relation of the four several Gospels to one another, and the extent to which one sacred writer may have availed himself of the work of a predecessor, is entirely foreclosed to the English reader. "There is no reason," it has been well said, "why such interesting discussions as those contained in Michaelis, and the notes of his learned translator and commentator, Bishop Marsh, with reference to the correspondence, verbal or substantial, and also to the variances, of the different Gospel narratives, should not be as open to an English reader as to the Greek scholar. While the harmony of many passages, common to two or more evangelists, whether, as in some cases, it be perfect, or, as in others, only substantial, bears in so interesting a manner on the questions involved

in the discussions alluded to, our version seems based on a studied design to confound and mislead as to the actual facts."

Not otherwise, in a quotation from the Old Testament, if two or more sacred writers quote it in absolutely identical words, this fact ought to be reproduced in the version. It is not so in respect of the important quotation from Gen. xv., 6; but on the three occasions that it is quoted (Rom. iv., 3; Gal. iii., 6; James ii., 23), it appears with variations, slight, indeed, and not in the least affecting the sense, but yet which would better have been avoided. Again, the phrase ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας, occurring twice in the New Testament, has so fixed, I may say, so technical a significance, referring as it does to a continually recurring phrase of the Old Testament, that it should not be rendered on one occasion "a sweet-smelling savor" (Eph. v., 2), on the other "an odor of a sweet smell" (Phil. iv., 18).

In other ways interesting and important relations between different parts of Scripture would come out more strongly if what is precisely similar in the original had reappeared as precisely similar in the translation. The Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians profess to have been sent from Rome to the East by the same messenger (comp. Eph. vi., 21, 22; Col. iv., 7, 8); they were written, therefore, we may confidently conclude, about the same time. When we come to examine their internal structure, this exactly bears out what under such circumstances we should expect in letters proceeding from the pen of St. Paul—great differences, but at the same time remarkable points of contact and resemblance, both in the thoughts and in the words which are the garment of the thoughts. Paley has urged this as an internal evidence for the truth of those statements which these epistles make about themselves.* This internal evidence to which he appeals doubtless exists even now for the English reader, but it would press itself on his attention much more

* *Horæ Paulinæ*, vi., § 2.

strongly if the exact resemblances in the originals had been represented by exact resemblances in the copies. This oftentimes has not been the case. Striking coincidences in language between one epistle and the other, which exist in the Greek, do not exist in the English. For example, *ἐνέργεια* is "working," Eph. i., 19; it is "operation," Col. ii., 12: *ταπεινοφροσύνη* is "lowliness," Eph. iv., 2; "humbleness of mind," Col. iii., 12: *συμβιβαζόμενον* is "compacted," Eph. iv., 16; "knit together," Col. iii., 19; with much more of the same kind; as is accurately brought out by the late Professor Blunt,* who draws one of the chief motives why the clergy should study the Scriptures in the original languages from the shortcomings which exist in the translations of them.

Before leaving this branch of the subject, I will take a few words, and note the variety of rendering to which they are submitted in our version. I have not taken them altogether at random, yet some of these are by no means the most remarkable instances in their kind. They will, however, sufficiently illustrate the matter in hand.

Ἀθετέω, "to reject" (Mark vi., 26); "to despise" (Luke x., 16); "to bring to nothing" (1 Cor. i., 19); "to frustrate" (Gal. ii., 21); "to disannul" (Gal. iii., 15); "to cast off" (1 Tim. v., 12).

Ἀναστατόω, "to turn upside down" (Acts xvii., 6); "to make an uproar" (Acts xxi., 38); "to trouble" (Gal. v., 12).

Ἀποκάλυψις, "revelation" (Rom. ii., 5); "manifestation" (Rom. viii., 19); "coming" (1 Cor. i., 7); "appearing" (1 Pet. i., 7).

Δελεάζω, "to entice" (James i., 14); "to beguile" (2 Pet. ii., 14); "to allure" (2 Pet. ii., 18).

Ἐλέγχω, "to tell of [his] trespass" (Matt. xviii., 15); "to reprove" (John xvi., 8); "to convict" (John viii., 9); "to convince" (John viii., 46); "to rebuke" (1 Tim. v., 20).

Ζόφος, "darkness" (2 Pet. ii., 4); "mist" (2 Pet. ii., 17); "blackness" (Jude 13).

* *Duties of the Parish Priest*, p. 71. The whole section (p. 47–76) is eminently instructive.

Καταργέω, "to cumber" (Luke xiii., 7); "to make without effect" (Rom. iii., 3); "to make void" (Rom. iii., 31); "to make of none effect" (Rom. iv., 14); "to destroy" (Rom. vi., 6); "to loose" (Rom. vii., 2); "to deliver" (Rom. vii., 6); "to bring to naught" (1 Cor. i., 18); "to do away" (1 Cor. xiii., 10); "to put away" (1 Cor. xiii., 11); "to put down" (1 Cor. xv., 24); "to abolish" (2 Cor. iii., 13). Add to these, καταργέομαι, "to come to naught" (1 Cor. ii., 6); "to fail" (1 Cor. xiii., 8); "to vanish away" (ibid.); "to become of none effect" (Gal. v., 4); "to cease" (Gal. v., 11); and we have here seventeen different renderings of this word, occurring in all twenty-seven times in the New Testament.

Καταρτίζω, "to mend" (Matt. iv., 21); "to perfect" (Matt. xxi., 16); "to fit" (Rom. ix., 22); "to perfectly join together" (1 Cor. i., 10); "to restore" (Gal. vi., 1); "to prepare" (Heb. x., 5); "to frame" (Heb. xi., 3); "to make perfect" (Heb. xiii., 21).

Καυχάομαι, "to make boast" (Rom. ii., 17); "to rejoice" (Rom. v., 2); "to glory" (Rom. v., 3); "to joy" (Rom. v., 11); "to boast" (2 Cor. vii., 14).

Κρατέω, "to take" (Matt. ix., 25); "to lay hold on" (Matt. xii., 11); "to lay hands on" (Matt. xviii., 28); "to hold fast" (Matt. xxvi., 48); "to hold" (Matt. xxviii., 9); "to keep" (Mark ix., 10); "to retain" (John xx., 23); "to obtain" (Acts xxvii., 13).

Παρακαλέω, "to comfort" (Matt. ii., 18); "to beseech" (Matt. viii., 5); "to desire" (Matt. xviii., 32); "to pray" (Matt. xxvi., 53); "to entreat" (Luke xv., 28); "to exhort" (Acts ii., 40); "to call for" (Acts xxviii., 20).

Πατριά, "lineage" (Luke ii., 4); "kindred" (Acts iii., 25); "family" (Ephes. iii., 15).

Let me once more observe, in leaving this part of the subject, that I would not for an instant imply that in all these places one and the same English word could have been employed, but only that the variety might have been much smaller than it actually is.

## CHAPTER VI.

### ON SOME REAL DISTINCTIONS EFFACED.

If it is impossible, as has been shown already, in every case to render one word in the original by one word, constantly employed, in the translation, equally impossible is it, as was shown at the same time, to render in every case different words in the original by different words in the translation; it continually happening that one language possesses, and fixes in words, distinctions of which another takes no note. But, with the freest recognition of this, the forces and capacities of a language should be stretched to the uttermost, the riches of its synonyms thoroughly searched out; and not till this is done, not till its resources prove plainly insufficient to the task, ought translators to acquiesce in the disappearance from their copy of distinctions which existed in the original from which that copy was made, or to count that, notwithstanding this disappearance, they have accomplished all that lay on them to accomplish. More might assuredly have been here done than has by our translators been attempted, as I will endeavor by a few examples to prove.

Thus one must always regret, and the regret has been often expressed—it was so by Broughton almost as soon as our version was published*—that in the Apocalypse our translators should have rendered *θηρίον* and *ζῶον* by the same word, "beast." Both play important parts in the book; both belong to its higher symbolism, but to portions the most different. The *ζῶα*, or "living creatures," which stand before the throne, in which dwells the fullness of all creaturely life, as it

* Of the *ζῶα*, or "wights," as he and other of our early divines called them, he says, in language hardly too strong, "they are barbarously translated *beasts*."—*Works*, p. 639.

gives praise and glory to God (iv., 6, 7, 8, 9; v., 6; vi., 1; and often), form part of the *heavenly* symbolism; the *θηρία*, the first beast and the second, which rise up, one from the bottomless pit (xi., 7), the other from the sea (xiii., 1), of which the one makes war upon the two witnesses, the other opens his mouth in blasphemies, these form part of the *hellish* symbolism. To confound these and those under a common designation, to call those "beasts" and these "beasts," would be an oversight, even granting the name to be suitable to both; it is a most serious one when the word used, bringing out, as this must, the predominance of the lower animal life, is applied to glorious creatures in the very court and presence of Heaven. The error is common to all the translations. That the Rheims should not have escaped it is strange; for the Vulgate renders *ζῶα* by "animalia" ("animantia" would have been still better), and only *θηρίον* by "bestia." If *ζῶα* had always been rendered "living creatures," this would have had the additional advantage of setting these symbols of the Apocalypse, even for the English reader, in an unmistakable connection with Ezek. i., 5, 13, 14, and often; where "living creature" is the rendering in our English Version of חַיָּה, as *ζῶον* is in the Septuagint.

Matt. xxii., 1–14.—In this parable of the Marriage of the King's Son, the *δοῦλοι* who summon the bidden guests (ver. 3, 4), and the *διάκονοι* who in the end expel the unworthy intruder (ver. 13), should not have been confounded under the common name of "servants." A real and important distinction between the several actors in the parable is in this way obliterated. The *δοῦλοι* are *men*, the ambassadors of Christ, those that invite their fellow-men to the blessings of the kingdom of heaven; but the *διάκονοι* are *angels*, those that "stand by" (Luke xix., 24), ready to fulfill the divine judgments, and whom we ever find the executors of these judgments in the day of Christ's appearing. They are as distinct from one another as the "servants of the householder," who in like manner are men, and the "reapers," who are angels,

in the parable of the Tares (Matt. xiii., 27, 30). The distinction which we have lost the Vulgate has preserved; the δοῦλοι are "servi," the διάκονοι "ministri;" and all our early translations in like manner rendered the words severally by "servants" and "ministers," the Rheims by "servants" and "waiters."*

There is a very real distinction between ἀπιστία and ἀπείθεια. It is often urged by our elder divines, as by Jackson in more passages than one, but it is not constantly observed by our translators. Ἀπιστία is, I believe, always and rightly rendered "unbelief," while ἀπείθεια is in most cases rendered, and rightly, "disobedience;" perhaps "contumacy" would still better have expressed the positive active character which in it is implied; but on two occasions (Heb. iv., 6, 11) it also is translated "unbelief." In like manner, ἀπιστεῖν is properly "to refuse *belief*," ἀπειθεῖν "to refuse *obedience*;" but ἀπειθεῖν is often in our translation allowed to run into the sense of ἀπιστεῖν, as at John iii., 36; Acts xiv., 2; xix., 9; Rom. xi., 30 (the right translation in the margin); and yet, as I have said, the distinction is real; ἀπείθεια, or "disobedience," is the result of ἀπιστία, or "unbelief;" they are not identical with one another.

Again, there was no possible reason why σοφός and φρόνιμος

* The remarkable fact that δοῦλος is never rendered "slave" in our version, that a word apparently of such prime necessity as "slave" only occurs twice in the whole English Bible—once in the old Testament (Jer. ii., 14) and once in the New (Rev. xviii., 13, for σώματα), must be explained in part by the comparative newness of the word in our language (Gascoigne is the earliest authority for it which our Dictionaries give). This, however, would not of itself be sufficient to account for it, in the presence of the frequent employment of "slave" in the contemporary writings of Shakespeare. The reason lies deeper. In the ancient world, where almost all service was slavery, there was no opprobium, no ethical contempt tinging the word δοῦλος. It is otherwise with "slave" in that modern world where slavery and liberty exist side by side, where it is felt that no man ought to be a slave, that no *very* brave man would be; that the service which the slave renders is rendered not for conscience sake, but of compulsion. It is impossible to dissociate the word now from something of contempt. "Paul, the *slave* of Jesus Christ," literally accurate, would in fact have said something very different from Παῦλος, δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

should not have been kept asunder, and the real distinction which exists between them in the original maintained also in our version. We possess "wise" for *σοφός*, and "prudent" for *φρόνιμος*. It is true that *συνετός* has taken possession of "prudent," but might have better been rendered by "understanding." Our translators have thrown away their advantage here, rendering, I believe in every case, both *σοφός* and *φρόνιμος* by "wise," although in no single instance are the words interchangeable. The *φρόνιμος* is one who dexterously adapts his means to his ends (Luke xvi., 8), the word expressing nothing in respect of the ends themselves, whether they are worthy or not; the *σοφός* is one whose means and ends are alike worthy. God is *σοφός* (Jude 25); wicked men may be *φρόνιμοι*, while *σοφοί*, except in the *σοφία τοῦ κόσμου*, which is itself an ironical term, they could never be. How much would have been gained at Luke xvi., 8, if *φρονίμως* had been rendered not "wisely," but "prudently;" how much needless offense would have been avoided!

The standing word which St. Paul uses to express the forgiveness of sins is *ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν*; but on one remarkable occasion he changes his word, and instead of *ἄφεσις* employs *πάρεσις* (Rom. iii., 25). Our translators take no note of the very noticeable substitution, but render *πάρεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*, or rather here *ἁμαρτημάτων*, "*remission* of sins," as every where else they have rendered the more usual phrase. But it was not for nothing that St. Paul used here quite another word. He is speaking of quite a different thing; he is speaking, not of the "remission" of sins, or the letting of them quite go, but of the "pretermission" (*πάρεσις*, from *παρίημι*), the passing of them by on the part of God for a while, the temporary dissimulation upon his part, which found place under the old covenant, in consideration of the great sacrifice which was one day to be. The passage is further obscured by the fact that our translators have rendered *διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν* as though it had been *διὰ τῆς παρέσεως*—"*for* the remission," that is, with a view to the remission, while the proper rendering of *διά*,

with an accusative, would of course have been "*because of* the remission," or, better, "the pretermission," or, as Hammond proposes, "because of *the passing by*, of past sins." What the apostle would say is this: "There needed a signal manifestation of the righteousness of God on account of the long pretermission, or passing by, of sins in his infinite forbearance, with no adequate expression of his righteous wrath against them during all those ages which preceded the revelation of Christ; which manifestation of his righteousness at length found place when he set forth no other and no less than his own Son to be the propitiatory sacrifice for sin." But the passage, as we have it now, can not be said to yield this meaning.

There are two occasions on which a multitude is miraculously fed by our Lord; and it is not a little remarkable that on the first occasion in every narrative, and there are four records of the miracle, the word κόφινος is used of the baskets in which the fragments which remain are gathered up (Matt. xiv., 20; Mark vi., 43; Luke ix., 17; John vi., 13), while on occasion of the second miracle, in the two records which are all that we have of it, σπυρίς is used (Matt. xv., 37; Mark viii., 8); and in proof that this is not accidental, see Matt. xvi., 9, 10; Mark viii., 19, 20. The fact is a slight, yet not unimportant, testimony to the entire distinctness of the two miracles, and that we have not here, as some of the modern assailants of the historical accuracy of the Gospels assure us, two confused traditions of one and the same event. What the exact distinction between κόφινος and σπυρίς is may be hard to determine, and it may not be very easy to suggest what second word should have marked this distinction; for "maunds" is now obsolete, and a "canister" is not a basket any longer; yet I can not but think that where not merely the evangelists in their narrative, but the Lord in his allusion to the event, so distinctly marks a difference, we should have attempted to mark it also, as the Vulgate by "cophini" and "sportæ" has done.

Again, our translators obliterate, for the most part, the distinction between παῖς Θεοῦ and υἱὸς Θεοῦ as applied to Christ. There are five passages in the New Testament in which the title παῖς Θεοῦ is given to the Son of God. In the first of these (Matt. xii., 18) they have rendered παῖς by "servant;" and they would have done well if they had abode by this in the other four. These all occur in the Acts, and in every one of them the notion of "servant" is abandoned, and "son" (Acts iii., 13, 26), or "child" (Acts iv., 27, 30), introduced. I can not but feel that in this they were in error. Παῖς Θεοῦ might be rendered "servant of God," and I am persuaded that it ought. It might be, for it needs not to say παῖς is continually used like the Latin "puer" in the sense of servant, and in the LXX. παῖς Θεοῦ as the "servant of God;" David calls himself so no less than seven times in 2 Sam. vii.; comp. Luke i., 69; Acts iv., 25; Job i., 8; Psa. xix., 12, 14. But not merely it might have been thus rendered; it also should have been, as these reasons convince me: Every student of prophecy must have noticed how much there is in Isaiah prophesying of Christ under the aspect of "the *servant* of the Lord;" "Israel my *servant*;" "my *servant* whom I uphold" (Isa. xlii., 1–7; xlix., 1–12; lii., 13; liii., 11). I say, prophesying of Christ; for I dismiss, as a baseless dream of those who *à priori* are determined that there are, and therefore shall be, no prophecies in Scripture, the notion that "the servant of Jehovah" in Isaiah is Israel according to the flesh, or Isaiah himself, or the body of the prophets collectively considered, or any other except Christ himself. But it is quite certain, from the inner harmonies of the Old Testament and the New, that wherever there is a large group of prophecies in the Old, there is some allusion to them in the New. Unless, however, we render παῖς Θεοῦ by "servant of God" in the places where that phrase occurs in the New, there will be no allusion throughout it all to that group of prophecies which designate the Messiah as the servant of Jehovah, who learned obedience by the things which he suffer-

ed. I can not doubt, and, as far as I know, this is the conclusion of all who have considered the subject, that παῖς Θεοῦ should be rendered "servant of God" as often as in the New Testament it is used of Christ. His *Sonship* will remain sufficiently declared in innumerable other passages.

Something of precision and beauty is lost at John x., 16, through a rendering of αὐλή and ποίμνη both by "fold:" "And other sheep I have, which are not of this *fold* (αὐλῆς); these also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one *fold* (ποίμνη) and one shepherd." It is remarkable that in the Vulgate there is the same obliteration of the distinction between the two words, "ovile" standing for both. Substitute "flock" for "fold" on the second occasion of its occurring (this was Tyndale's rendering, which we should not have forsaken), and it will be at once felt how much the verse will gain. The Jew and the Gentile are the two "folds" which Christ, the Good Shepherd, will gather into a single "flock."

As a farther example, take John xvii., 12: "While I was with them in the world, I *kept* them in thy name. Those that thou gavest me I have *kept*, and none of them is lost." It is not a great matter; yet who would not gather from this "kept," recurring twice in this verse, that there must be also in the original some word of the like recurrence? Yet it is not so; the first "kept" is ἐτήρουν, and the second ἐφύλαξα: nor are τηρεῖν and φυλάσσειν here such mere synonyms that the distinction between them may be effaced without loss. The first is "servare," or, better, "conservare;" the second "custodire;" and the first, the keeping or preserving, is the consequence of the second, the guarding. What the Lord would say is, "I so guarded, so protected (ἐφύλαξα), those whom thou hast given me, that I kept and preserved them (this the τήρησις) unto the present day." Thus Lampe: "τηρεῖν est generalius, vitæque novæ *finalem* conservationem potest exprimere; φυλάσσειν vero specialius *mediorum* præstationem, per quæ finis ille obtinetur;" and he proceeds to quote,

excellently to the point, Prov. xix., 16: ὃς φυλάσσει ἐντολήν, τηρεῖ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχήν.

Before leaving this branch of the subject, I will give a few examples more of the way in which a single word in the English does duty for many in the Greek. "To ordain" stands for all these words: καθίστημι (Tit. i., 5); ὁρίζω (Acts x., 42); ποιέω (Mark iii., 14); τάσσω (Acts xiii., 48); τίθημι (John xv., 16); χειροτονέω (Acts xiv., 23). Again, we are tempted to ask, without always being able, even while we ask the question, to offer a satisfactory answer to it, might not something have been done to distinguish between ἀναστροφή (Gal. i, 13), τρόπος (Heb. xiii., 5), πολίτευμα (Phil. iii., 20), all rendered "conversation;" between φονεύς (1 Pet. iv., 15), σικάριος (Acts xxi., 38), ἀνθρωποκτόνος (1 John iii., 15), all rendered "murderer;" between δίκτυον (Matt. iv., 20), ἀμφίβληστρον (Matt. iv., 18), and σαγήνη (Matt. xiii., 47), all translated "net?" Or take the words "thought" and "to think." The Biblical psychology is anyhow a subject encumbered with most serious perplexities. He finds it so, and often sees his way but obscurely, who has all the helps which the most accurate observation and comparison of the terms actually used by the sacred writers will afford. Of course, none but the student of the original document can have these helps in their fullness; at the same time, it scarcely needed that "thought" should be employed as the rendering alike of ἐνθύμησις (Matt. ix., 4), διαλογισμός (Matt. xv., 19), διανόημα (Luke xi., 17), ἐπίνοια (Acts viii., 22), λογισμός (Rom. ii., 15), and νόημα (2 Cor. x., 5); or that the verb "to think" should in the passages which follow be the one English representative of a still wider circle of words, of δοκέω (Matt. iii., 9), νομίζω (Matt. v., 17), ἐνθυμέομαι (Matt. ix., 4), διαλογίζομαι (Luke xii., 17), διενθυμέομαι (Acts x., 19), ὑπονοέω (Acts xiii., 25), ἡγέομαι (Acts xxvi., 2), κρίνω (Acts xxvi., 8), φρονέω (Rom. xii., 3), λογίζομαι (2 Cor. iii., 5), νοέω (Eph. iii., 20), οἴομαι (James i., 7).*

* For the distinction between some, at least, of these, a distinction which it

One example more. The verb "to trouble" is a very favorite one with our translators. There are no less than ten Greek words or phrases which it is employed by them to render; these, namely: *κόπους παρέχω* (Matt. xxvi., 10), *σκύλλω* (Mark v., 35), *διαταράσσω* (Luke i., 29), *τυρβάζω* (Luke x., 41), *παρενοχλέω* (Acts xv., 19), *θορυβέομαι* (Acts xx., 10), *ταράσσω* (Gal. i., 7), *ἀναστατόω* (Gal. v., 12), *θλίβω* (2 Thess. i., 6), *ἐνοχλέω* (Heb. xii., 15). If we add to these *ἐκταράσσω*, "exceedingly to trouble" (Acts xvi., 20), *θροέομαι*, "to be troubled" (Matt. xxiv., 6), the word will do duty for no fewer than twelve Greek words. Now the English language may not be so rich in synonyms as the Greek; but with "vex," "harass," "annoy," "disturb," "distress," "afflict," "disquiet," "unsettle," "burden," "terrify," almost every one of which would in one of the above places or other seem to me more appropriate than the word actually employed, I can not admit that the poverty or limited resources of our language left no choice here but to efface all the distinctions between these words, as by the employment of "trouble" for them all has, in these cases at least, been done.

would be quite possible to reproduce in English, see Vömel, *Synon. Wörterbuch*, p. 131, s. v. "glauben."

## CHAPTER VII.

### ON SOME BETTER RENDERINGS FORSAKEN, OR PLACED IN THE MARGIN.

Occasionally, but rarely, our translators dismiss a better rendering, which was in one or more of the earlier versions, and replace it by a worse. It may be said of their version, in comparison with those which went before, that it occupies very much the place which the Vulgate did in regard of the Latin versions preceding. In the whole, an immense improvement, while yet in some minor details they are more accurate than it. This is so in the passages which follow.

Matt. xxviii., 14.—"And if this *come to the governor's ears*, we will persuade him, and secure you." The Geneva Version, but that alone among the previous ones,* had given the

* It is evident that there must have been some very good and careful scholarship brought to bear on this version, or revision rather. I have observed, on several occasions, that it is the first to seize the exact meaning of a passage, which all the preceding versions had missed. I will adduce, in a note, three or four occasions which present themselves to me where this has been the case.

Mark xiv., 72.—Καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιε. All versions, from Wicliffe to Cranmer inclusive, "And began to weep," a rendering which even our Authorized Version has allowed in the margin. But the Geneva rightly, "And *weighing that with himself* (ἐπιβαλών, that is, τὸν νοῦν), he wept." Our version is indeed better, "And *when he thought thereon*, he wept;" but the Geneva is correct, and the first which is so.

Luke xi., 17.—Καὶ οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον, πίπτει. Tyndale had it, "And one house shall fall upon another;" Cranmer and Coverdale the same. Even to this present day there are those who maintain this version—Meyer, for instance, with that singular perversity which, amid his eminent exegetical tact, he contrives sometimes to display—making this not an independent clause and thought, but merely a drawing out more at large the ἐρήμωσις of the βασιλεία, just before spoken of. But the Geneva rightly, assuming a comma after οἶκον, and drawing a διαμερισθείς from the preceding clause into this, "And a house divided against itself, falleth:" comp. Matt. xii., 35.

Acts xxiii., 27.—Ἐξειλόμην αὐτὸν, μαθὼν ὅτι Ῥωμαῖος ἐστιν. Here, too,

passage rightly: "And if this *come before the governor* (*καὶ ἐὰν ἀκουσθῇ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος*), we will pacify him, and save you harmless." The words of the original have reference to a judicial hearing of the matter before the governor ("si res apud illum judicem agatur," Erasmus), and not to the possibility of its reaching his ears by hearsay; but this our translation fails to express. In *πείσομεν*, I may observe, lies a euphemism by no means rare in Hellenistic Greek (see Krebs, *Obss. e Josepho, in loco*): "We will take effectual means to persuade him;" as, knowing the covetous, greedy character of the man, they were able confidently to promise.

the Geneva is the first which brings out the characteristic untruth of which Lysias, who otherwise recommends himself favorably to us, is guilty in his letter to Felix. Wishing to obtain credit with his superior officer, to set his own zeal in the most favorable light, he contrives, by a slight shifting of the order of events, to make it appear that he rescued Paul out of the hands of the fanatic Jewish populace, "*having understood* that he was a Roman;" when, indeed, he only discovered the citizenship of Paul at a later period (comp. xxi., 32, 33, and xxii., 27), and not until he had grossly outraged the majesty of Rome in him, all mention of which he naturally suppresses. The earlier Anglican versions had it, "Then came I with soldiers and rescued him, *and perceived* that he was a Roman;" as though, which was indeed the fact, but not what he would present as the fact, he had perceived this after the rescue; but the Geneva rightly, "*perceiving* that he was Roman"—not the truth, but what he would present as the truth. The attempt of Grotius to make *μαθών* here=*καὶ ἔμαθον* must be decidedly rejected; see Winer, *Gramm.*, § 46.

Acts xxvii., 9.—*Διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν νηστείαν ἤδη παρεληλυθέναι.* None of our earlier translators appear to have been aware that *ἡ νηστεία* was a name by which the great fast of the Atonement, being the only fast specially commanded in the Jewish ritual (Lev. xvi., 29; xxiii., 27), was technically known; see Philo, *De Septen.*, § 2. We may see from Tyndale's words, "because also we had overlong fasted," how utterly astray they would be, in consequence of this ignorance, as regards the meaning of this passage. But the Geneva rightly, "because also the time of the fast was now passed."

James i., 13.—*Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἀπείραστός ἐστι κακῶν.* All the translations which had gone before, from Wickliffe to Cranmer, giving to *ἀπείραστος* an active signification, which it certainly might have, but has not here, had made this clause a mere tautology to that which follows. Thus Tyndale: "For God *tempteth not unto evil*, neither tempteth he any man." The Geneva first ascribed to *ἀπείραστος* its proper passive force (see Winer, *Gramm.*, § 30, 4), translating in words which our version has retained, "For God *can not be tempted with evil*, neither tempteth he any man."

Mark xi., 17.—"Is it not written, My house shall be called *of all nations* the house of prayer? but ye have made it a den of thieves." In Tyndale's version, in Cranmer's, and the Geneva, "My house shall be called the house of prayer *unto all nations;* but ye, etc.," and rightly. There is no difficulty whatever in giving *πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι* a dative rather than an ablative sense, while thus the passage is brought into exact agreement with that in Isaiah, to which Christ, in his "Is it not written?" refers, namely, Isa. lvi., 7; and, moreover, the point of his words is preserved, which the present translation misses. Our Lord's indignation was aroused in part at the profanation of the holy precincts of his Father's house, but in part, also, by the fact that, the scene of this profanation being the court of the Gentiles, the Jews have thus managed to testify their contempt for them, and for their share in the blessings of the covenant. Those parts of the Temple which were exclusively their own, the Court of the Priests and the Court of the Israelites, they had kept clear of these buyers and sellers; but that part assigned to the Gentile worshipers, the *σεβόμενοι τὸν Θεόν*, they were little concerned about the profanation to which it was exposed, perhaps pleased with it rather. But He who came into the world to be a Redeemer, not of Jews only, but also of Gentiles, quotes in a righteous indignation the words of the prophet, which they had done all that in them lay to irritate and defeat: "My house shall be called the house of prayer *unto all nations*:" all which intention on his part in the citation of the prophecy our version fails to preserve. Mede, in an interesting discourse upon the text,* ascribes to the influence of Beza this alteration, which is certainly one for the worse.

Luke xvi., 1.—"The same was accused unto him *that he had wasted* his goods." The Geneva had corrected this, which was in Tyndale and Cranmer, and given to *ὡς διασκορπίζων* its proper sense, "*that he wasted*," the accusation referring not to what the steward had done, but now was doing.

* *Works*, London, 1672, p. 44; comp. p. 11.

Acts xxi., 3.—"For there the ship *was to unlade* her burden." This, supported though it be by Valckenaer ("eo navis merces *expositura erat*") and others, is incorrect. There can no such future sense be given to ἦν ἀποφορτιζόμενον; see Winer, *Gramm.*, § 46, 5. St. Luke would say "was unlading," or "was engaged in unlading;" and Tyndale rightly, whom Cranmer and the Geneva follow: "For there the ship *unladed* her burden." He is speaking from a point of view taken after the ship's arrival at this place, and of what it actually did, not of what it should do.

Ephes. iv., 18.—"Because of the *blindness* of their hearts." The Geneva Version had given this rightly: "Because of the *hardness* of their heart;" which better rendering our translators forsake, being content to place it in the margin. But there can be no doubt that πώρωσις is from the substantive πῶρος, a porous kind of stone, and from πωρόω, to become callous, hard, or stony (Mark vi., 52; John xii., 40; Rom. xi., 7; 2 Cor. iii., 14); not from πωρός, blind. How much better, too, this agrees with what follows—"who, being *past feeling*" (that is, having through their hardness or callousness of heart arrived at a condition of miserable ἀναισθησία), "have given themselves over to work all uncleanness with greediness." I may observe that at Rom. xi., 7, they have in like manner put "blinded" in the text, and "hardened," the correct rendering of ἐπωρώθησαν, in the margin; while at 2 Cor. iii., 14, where they translate ἀλλ' ἐπωρώθη τὰ νοήματα αὐτῶν, "but their minds *were blinded*," the correcter is not even offered as an alternative rendering. Wicliffe and the Rheims, which both depend on the Vulgate ("sed *obtusi sunt* sensus eorum"), are here the only correct versions.

1 Thess. v., 22.—"Abstain from all *appearance* of evil." An injurious rendering of the words ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους πονηροῦ ἀπέχεσθε, and a going back from the right translation. "Abstain from all *kind* of evil," which the Geneva Version had. It is from the *reality* of evil, and εἶδος here means this (see a good note in Hammond), not from the *appearance*, which

God's Word elsewhere commands us to abstain; nor does it here command any other thing.* Indeed, there are times when, so far from abstaining from all *appearance* of evil, it will be a part of Christian courage *not* to abstain from such. It was an "*appearance* of evil" in the eyes of the Pharisees when our Lord healed on the Sabbath, or showed himself a friend of publicans and sinners; but Christ did not therefore abstain from this or from that. How many "appearances of evil," which he might have abstained from, yet did not, must St.Paul's own conversation have presented in the eyes of the zealots for the ceremonial law. I was once inclined to think that our translators used "appearance" here as we might now use "form," and that we therefore had here an obsolete, not an inaccurate rendering; but I can find no authority for this use of the word.

1 Tim. vi., 5.—"Supposing *that gain is godliness.*" It is difficult to connect any meaning whatever with this language. But Coverdale, and he alone of our translators, deals with these words, *νομιζόντων πορισμὸν εἶναι τὴν εὐσέβειαν*, rightly—"which think *that godliness is lucre*," *i. e.*, a means of gain. The want of a thorough mastery of the Greek article and its use left it possible here to go back from a right rendering once attained.

Heb. ix., 23.—"It was therefore necessary that *the patterns* of things in the heavens should be purified with these, but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." "Patterns" introduces some confusion here, and is not justified by the word's use in the time of our translators any more than in our own. It is, of course, quite true that *ὑπόδειγμα* may mean, and, indeed, often does mean, "pattern" or "exemplar" (John xiii., 15). But here, as at viii., 5 (*ὑπόδειγμα καὶ σκία*), it can only mean the "copy" drawn from this

* Jeanes, chiefly remembered now for his theological controversy with Jeremy Taylor, in which the greater man had not always the best of the argument, in a treatise of some merit, *Concerning Abstinence from all Appearance of Evil* (*Works*, 1660, p. 68 *sqq.*), defends our present version of the words.

exemplar. The heavenly things themselves are "the patterns" or archetypes, the "Urbilder;" the earthly, the Levitical tabernacle, with its priests and sacrifices, are the copies, the similitudes, the "Abbilder," which, as such, are partakers, not of a real, but a typical purification. This is, indeed, the very point which the apostle is urging, and his whole antithesis is confused by calling the earthly things "the patterns," being, as they are, only the shadows of the true. The earlier translators, Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Geneva, had "similitudes," which was correct, though it seems to me that "copies" would be preferable.*

Heb. xi., 13.—"These all died in faith; not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and *embraced* them." But with all respect be it said, this "*embracing* the promises" was the very thing which the worthies of the Old Testament did not do, and which the sacred writer is urging throughout that they did not do, who only saw them from afar, as things distant and not near. Our present rendering is an unfortunate going back from Tyndale's and Cranmer's "saluted them," from Wicliffe's "greeted them." The beautiful image of mariners homeward bound, who recognize from afar the promontories and well-known features of a beloved land, and "greet" or "salute" these from a distance, is lost to us. Estius: "Chrysostomus dictum putat ex metaphorâ navigantium qui ex longinquo prospiciunt civitates desideratas, quas antequam ingrediantur et inhabitent, salutatione præveniunt." Comp. Virgil, *Æn.*, iii., 524:

"Italiam læto socii clamore *salutant.*"

In other respects our own version is unsatisfactory. The

* It is familiarly known to all students of English that "pattern" is originally only another spelling of "patron" (the client imitates his *patron;* the copy takes after its *pattern*), however they may have now separated off into two words. But it is interesting to notice the word when as yet this separation of one into two had not uttered itself in different orthography. We do this Heb. viii., 5 (Geneva Version): "which priestes serve unto the *patrone* and shadow of heavenly things."

words, "and were persuaded of them," have no right to a place in the text; while the "afar off" (*πόρρωθεν*) belongs not to the seeing alone, but to the saluting as well. How beautifully the verse would read thus amended: "These all died in faith; not having received the promises, but having seen and saluted them from afar." We have exactly such a salutation from afar in the words of the dying Jacob: "I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord" (Gen. xlix., 18).

1 Pet. i., 17.—"And if *ye call on the Father*, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man's work, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear." Here, too, it must be confessed that we have left a better and chosen a worse rendering. The Geneva had it, "And if *ye call Him Father*, who without respect of persons, etc.," and this, and this only, is the meaning which the words of the original, *καὶ εἰ Πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρίνοντα, κ.τ.λ.*, will bear.

It must not be supposed from what has been here adduced that our translators did not exercise a very careful revision of the translations preceding. In every page of their work there is evidence that they did so. Of many passages our Authorized Version is the first that has seized the true meaning. It would be easy for me to bring forward many proofs of this, only that my task is here, passing over the hundred excellencies, to fasten rather on the single fault; and I must therefore content myself with just sufficient to confirm my assertion. Thus, at Heb. iv., 1, none of the preceding versions, neither the Anglican, nor the Rheims, had correctly given *καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας*: they all translate it "forsaking the promise," or something similar, instead of, as we have rightly done, "a promise being left us." Again, at Acts xii., 19, the technical meaning of *ἀπαχθῆναι* (like the Latin "duci," "agi"), that it signifies here to be "led away *to execution*" (comp. Demosthenes, 431, 7), is wholly missed by Tyndale ("he examined the keepers and commanded *to depart*"), by Cranmer and the Rheims; it is only partially seized by the Geneva Version ("commanded them to be led

*to be punished*"), but perfectly by our translators. Far more important than this is the clear recognition of the personality of the Word in the prologue of St. John by our translators: "All things were made by *Him*;" "In *Him* was life" (John i., 3, 4); while in all our preceding versions it is read, "All things were made by *it*," and so on. Our version is the first which gives συναλιζόμενος (Acts i., 4) rightly.

Improvements also are very frequent in single words and phrases, even where those which are displaced were not absolutely incorrect. Thus, how much better "earnest expectation" (Rom. viii., 19) than "fervent desire," as a rendering of ἀποκαραδοκία; "moved with envy" (Acts vii., 9) than "having indignation" of ζηλώσαντες; "tattlers" than "triflers," as a rendering of φλύαροι (1 Tim. v., 13); indeed, the latter could hardly be said to be correct.* How much better "being *gotten* from them" than "being *parted* from them" (Acts xxi., 1), for it expresses, perhaps even it too weakly (ἀποσπασθέντας is the word in the original), the painful struggle with which this separation was effected, of which there is no hint in the versions preceding. "*Whited* sepulchres" is an improvement upon "*painted* sepulchres" (τάφοι κεκονιαμένοι, Matt. xxiii., 27), which all our preceding versions had. "Without *distraction*" (1 Cor. vii., 35) is a far better rendering of ἀπερισπάστως than "without *separation*." "Leopard" is better than "cat of the mountain," Rev. xiii., 2 (it is πάρδαλις in the original). "Mysteries," *i. e.*, "*religious* secrets," is much to be preferred to "secrets," which all our preceding Anglican versions had often, though not always, where the word μυστήριον occurred (Matt. xiii., 11; Rom. xi., 25; 1 Cor. xiii., 2). "Be opened" or "be disclosed," with which all that went before rendered ἀποκαλυφθῇ (2 Thess. ii., 3)—and compare ver. 8, "be uttered"—quite obscured the terrible signification of the *revelation*

* Unless, indeed, "trifler" once meant "utterer of trifles," and thus "tattler;" which may perhaps be, as I observe in the fragment of a *Nominale* published by Wright, *National Antiquities*, vol. i., p. 216, "nugigerulus" given as the Latin equivalent of "trifler."

of the Man of Sin, which the apostle sets over against the revelation of the Son of God. It was slovenly to introduce "Candy," the modern name of Crete, which all before our own had done, at Acts xxvii., 7, 12, 21, but which in ours is removed, and not less slovenly to confound "Nazarite" and "Nazarene," substituting the former for the latter, an error into which, in like manner, they all, at Matt. ii., 23, and Acts xxiv., 5, had fallen, introducing, in the former of these places at least, a new element of difficulty into a passage sufficiently difficult already.

But this going back from preferable renderings already attained is not all. There are better translations, derived either from the labors of their predecessors or suggested to themselves, which, provokingly enough, they half adopt, placing them in the margin, while they satisfy themselves with a worse in the text. It may perhaps be urged that here, at least, they offer the better to the reader's choice. But practically this can not be said to be the case. For, in the first place, the proportion of our Bibles is very small even now which are printed with these marginal variations, as compared with those in which they are suppressed. At one time it was smaller still; from some words of Hammond in the advertisement to his New Testament, it would seem they had entirely dropped out of use in his time—he speaks there of "the manner which was formerly used in our Bibles of the larger impression, of noting some other renderings in the margin." They are thus brought under the notice of very few among the readers of Scripture. Nor is this all. They are very rarely referred to even by these. How many, for instance, among these, even know of the existence of a variation so important as that at John iii., 3? And even if they do refer, they generally attach comparatively little authority to them. They acquiesce for the most part, and naturally acquiesce, in the verdict of the translators about them, who, by placing them in the margin and not in the text, evidently

declare that they consider them not the best, but the second best and the less probable renderings. Then, too, of course, they are never heard in the public services of the Church, which, till the Scriptures are far more diligently studied in private than now they are, must always be a chief source of the popular acquaintance with them. It is impossible, then, to attach to a right interpretation in the margin any serious value, as redressing an erroneous or imperfect one in the text. Marginal variations are quite without influence as modifying the impression which the body of English readers derive of any passages in the English Bible; and this leads me to observe, by the way, that the suggestion which has been sometimes made of a large addition to these, as a middle way and compromise between leaving our version as it is, and introducing actual changes into its text, does not seem to me to open any real escape from our difficulties, nor to offer any practical reconciliation of their wishes who claim and theirs who disclaim a revision, while the objections which would attend it are many.

But to return. The following are passages in which I can not doubt that the better version has been placed in the margin, the worse in the text.

Matt. v., 21; comp. ver. 27, 33.—"Ye have heard that it was said *by them* of old time." This rendering of ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις is grammatically defensible, while yet there can be no reasonable doubt that "*to them* of old time," which was in all the preceding versions, but which our translators have dismissed to the margin, ought to resume its place in the text. The four following passages, Rom. ix., 12, 26; Rev. vi., 11; ix., 4, are decisive in regard of the usage of the New Testament, and that we have here a dative, not an ablative.

Matt. ix., 36.—"They fainted and *were scattered abroad*, as sheep having no shepherd." But "scattered abroad" does not exactly express ἐρριμμένοι, any more than does the Luther's "zerstreut." It is not their *dispersion* one from another, but their *prostration* in themselves, which is intended.

The *ἐρριμμένοι* are the "prostrati," "temere projecti;" those that have cast themselves along for very weariness, unable to travel any farther; comp. Judith xiv., 15, LXX. The Vulgate has it rightly, "jacentes," which Wicliffe follows, "lying down." Our present rendering dates as far back as Tyndale, who probably got it from Luther, and it was retained in the subsequent versions, while the correct meaning is relegated to the margin.

Matt. x., 16.—"Be ye therefore wise as serpents, and *harmless* as doves." Wicliffe, following the Vulgate, had "*simple* as doves." "Simple" our translators have dismissed to the margin; they ought to have kept it in the text, as rightly they have done at Rom. xvi., 19. The rendering of *ἀκέραιος* by "harmless" here, and at Phil. ii., 15, grows out of wrong etymology, as though it were from *ἀ* and *κέρας*, one having no horn with which to push or otherwise hurt. Thus Bengel, who falls in with this error, glosses here: "*Sine cornu*, ungulâ, dente, aculeo." But this "without horn" would be *ἀκέρατος*, while the true derivation of *ἀκέραιος*, it need hardly be said, is from *ἀ* and *κεράννυμι*, unmingled, sincere, and thus single, guileless, simple, without all folds. How much finer the antithesis in this way becomes. "Be ye therefore wise" ("prudent" would be better) "as serpents, and *simple* as doves"* —having care, that is, that this prudence of yours do not degenerate into artifice and guile; letting the columbine simplicity go hand in hand with the serpentine prudence. The exact parallel will then be 1 Cor. xiv., 20.

Mark vi., 20.—"For Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and an holy, *and observed him*." This may be after Erasmus, who renders *καὶ συνετήρει αὐτόν* "et magni eum faciebat;" so, too, Grotius and others. Now it is undoubtedly true that *συντηρεῖν τὰ δίκαια* (Polybius, iv., 60, 10) would be rightly translated "to observe things righteous;"

* It is worthy of notice that Jeremy Taylor's great sermons on this text are severally entitled "Of Christian *Prudence*" and "Of Christian *Simplicity*" —a quiet rectification of the English text in the sense which is urged above.

but here it is not things, but a person, and no such rendering is admissible. Translate rather, as in our margin, "kept him or saved him," that is, from the malice of Herodias; she laid plots for the Baptist's life, but up to this time Herod *συνετήρει*, sheltered or preserved him ("custodiebat eum," the Vulgate rightly), so that her malice could not reach him; see Hammond, *in loco*. It will at once be evident in how much stricter logical sequence the statement of the evangelist will follow if this rendering of the passage is admitted.

Mark vii., 4.—"The washing of cups and pots, brazen vessels, and of *tables*." This can not be correct: our translators have put "beds" in the margin, against which rendering of *κλινῶν* nothing can be urged except that the context points clearly here to these in a special aspect, namely, to the "benches" or "couches" on which the Jews reclined at their meals.

Luke xvii., 21.—"The kingdom of heaven is *within you*." Doubtless *ἐντὸς ὑμῶν may* mean this; but how could the Lord address this language *to the Pharisees?* A very different kingdom from the kingdom of heaven was *within them*, not to say that this whole language of the kingdom of heaven being within men, rather than men being within the kingdom of heaven, is, as one has justly observed, modern. The marginal reading, "among you," should have been the textual. "He in whom the whole kingdom of heaven is shut up as in a germ, and from whom it will unfold itself, *stands in your midst*."

John xiv., 18.—"I will not leave you *comfortless*." Upon these words Archdeacon Hare observes: "What led our translators, from Tyndale downward, to render *οὐκ ἀφήσω ὑμᾶς ὀρφανούς* by 'I will not leave you *comfortless*,' I can not perceive. Wicliffe has 'fadirless.' 'Orphans,' the marginal reading, ought to have been received into the text, for the force and beauty of the original are much impaired by the change."* If there was a difficulty working in their minds, namely, how *his* departure could be said to leave them "orphans" or "*fa-*

* *Mission of the Comforter*, p. 527.

*therless*," he being rather "the first-born among many *brethren*," there was "destitute" and "desolate," either of which would have been nearer to the original than "comfortless" is.

John xvi., 8.—"And when he is come, he will *reprove* the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." We have, perhaps, nowhere in our version more reason to regret than here that the marginal reading "convince" has not changed places with the textual "reprove"—that "convince" is not in the text, and "reprove," if it had been thought desirable to retain it at all, in the margin. It need hardly be observed what a depth of meaning there is, or may be, in ἐλέγχειν—and being ascribed to the Holy Ghost, we must not stop short of the fullest and deepest meaning that the word will bear—how much more than is expressed by "reprove." It is not to "reprove" alone, but to bring home to the conscience of the reproved man, however unwilling he may be to admit it, a sense of the truth of the charge; and all this, or nearly all this, our word "convince" expresses, or might be brought to express. Samuel *reproved* Saul of sin (1 Sam. xv., 19, 20), Nathan *convinced* David (2 Sam. xii., 7–13), and, though less effectually, Elijah *convinced* Ahab (1 Kings xxi., 27–29). How much more glorious a work this to ascribe to the Holy Ghost than that other! Indeed, it is properly his work, and his only; no man has in the highest sense been *convinced* of sin unless He has wrought the conviction.*

Col. ii., 18.—"Let no man *beguile you of your reward*." It is evident that this καταβραβευέτω ὑμᾶς seriously perplexed all our early translators, and, indeed, others besides them. Thus in the Italic we find "vos superet;" in the Vulgate, "vos decipiat;" Tyndale translates, "make you shoot at a wrong mark;" the Geneva, "wilfully bear rule over you;" while our translators have proposed as an alternative reading to that

* All familiar with Archdeacon Hare's *Mission of the Comforter* will remember how much of excellent there is there upon this point in the text, p. 35–40, and in the long and learned note, which is appended to the text, what there is more valuable still, p. 528–544.

which they admit into the text, "judge against you." The objection to this last, which marks more insight into the true character of the word than any which went before, is that it is too obscure, and does not sufficiently tell its own story. The meaning of *βραβεύειν* is to adjudge a reward; of *καταβραβεύειν*, out of a hostile mind (this is implied in the *κατά*) to adjudge it away from a person, with the subaudition that this is the person to whom it is justly due. Jerome (*ad Algas., Qu.* 10) does not quite seize the meaning, for he regards the *καταβραβεύων* as the competitor who unjustly bears away, not the judge who unjustly ascribes the reward; otherwise his explanation is good: "Nemo adversum vos bravium accipiat: hoc enim Græcè dicitur *καταβραβενέτω*, quum quis in certamine positus, iniquitate agonothetæ, vel insidiis magistrorum, *βραβεῖον* et palmam sibi debitam perdit." It is impossible for any English word to express the fullness of allusion contained in the original Greek, while long circumlocutions, which should turn the version, in fact, into a commentary, are clearly inadmissible. If "judge against you" is at once too obscure and too little of an English idiom, and "judge away the reward from you" might be objected against on at least the second of these grounds, the substitution of "deprive" for "beguile" (which last has certainly no claim to stand) would, in case of a revision, be desirable.

1 Thess. iv., 6.—"Let no man go beyond or defraud his brother *in any matter*." But *τῷ* here is not =*τῳ*=*τινι*, which would alone justify the rendering of *ἐν τῷ πράγματι*, "in *any* matter." A more correct translation is in the margin, namely, "in *the* matter," that is, "in *this* matter," being the matter with which the apostle at the moment has to do. The difference may not seem very important, but, indeed, the whole sense of the passage turns on this word; and, as we translate in one way or the other, we determine for ourselves whether it is a warning against overreaching our neighbor, and a too shrewd dealing with him in the business transactions of life, strangely finding place in the midst of warnings

against uncleanness and a libertine freedom in the relation of the sexes, or whether an unbroken warning against this latter evil is continued through all these verses (3–9). I can not doubt that the latter is the correct view; that τὸ πρᾶγμα is a euphemism, and our marginal version the right one; the apostle warning his Thessalonian converts that none, in a worse πλεονεξία than that which makes one man covet his neighbor's goods, overstep the limits and fences by which God has hedged round and separated from him his brother's wife. See Bengel, *in loco.* Accepting this view of the passage, "overreach," which the margin suggests instead of "defraud" as the rendering of πλεονεκτεῖν, would also be an undoubted improvement.

Heb. v., 2.—"Who *can have compassion on* the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way, for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity." But is, it may fairly be asked, "who can have compassion," the happiest rendering of μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος? and ought μετριοπαθεῖν to be thus taken as entirely synonymous with συμπαθεῖν? The words μετριοπαθεῖν, μετριοπάθεια, belong to the terminology of the later schools of Greek philosophy, and were formed to express that moderate amount of emotion (the μετρίως πάσχειν) which the Peripatetics and others acknowledged as becoming a wise and good man, contrasted with the ἀπάθεια, or absolute indolency, which the Stoics required. It seems to me that the apostle would say that the high-priest taken from among men, out of a sense of his own weakness and infirmity, was in a condition to estimate mildly and moderately, and not transported with indignation, the sins and errors of his brethren; and it is this view of the passage which is correctly expressed in the margin: "who *can reasonably bear with* the ignorant," etc.

2 Pet. iii., 12.—"*Hasting unto* the coming of the day of God." The Vulgate had in like manner rendered the σπεύδοντες τὴν παρουσίαν, "properantes *in* adventum;" and this use of σπεύδειν may be abundantly justified, although "hasting *toward* the coming" seems to me to express more accurately

what our translators probably intended, and what the word allows. This will then be pretty nearly De Wette's "ersehnend." Yet the marginal version, "*hasting* the coming" ("accelerantes adventum," Erasmus), seems better still. The faithful, that is, shall seek to cause the day of the Lord to come the more quickly by helping to fulfill those conditions, without which it can not come—that day being no day inexorably fixed, but one the arrival of which it is free to the Church to help and hasten on by faith and by prayer, and through a more rapid accomplishing of the number of the elect (Matt. xxiv., 14).

## CHAPTER VIII.

### ON SOME ERRORS OF GREEK GRAMMAR.

I HAVE already spoken of the *English* Grammar of our translators; but the *Greek* Grammar is also occasionally at fault. The most recurring blemishes which have been noted here are these: 1. A failing to give due heed to the presence or absence of the article; they omit it sometimes when it is present in their original, and when, according to the rules of the language, it ought to be preserved in the translation; they insert it when it is absent there, and has no claim to obtain admission from them. 2. A certain laxity in the rendering of prepositions; for example, ἐν is rendered as if it were εἰς, and *vice versâ;* the different forces of διά, as it governs a genitive or an accusative, are disregarded; with other negligences of the same kind. 3. A want of accurate discrimination of the forces of different tenses; aorists being dealt with as perfects, perfects as aorists; imperfects losing their imperfect, incompleted sense. Moods, too, and voices are occasionally confounded. 4. Other grammatical lapses, which can not be included in any of these divisions, are noticeable. These, however, are the most serious and most recurring. I will give examples of them all.

I. In regard of the Greek article our translators err both in excess and defect, but oftenest in the latter. They omit it, and sometimes not without serious loss, in passages where it ought to find place. Such a passage is Rev. vii., 14: "These are they which came out of great tribulation." Rather "out of *the* great tribulation" (ἐκ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλης). The leaving out of the article, so emphatically repeated, causes us to miss the connection between this passage and Matt. xxiv., 22, 29; Dan. xii., 1. It is the character of the Apocalypse, the crowning book of the Canon, that it

abounds with allusions to preceding Scriptures; and, numerous as are those that appear on the surface, those which lie a little below the surface are more numerous still. Thus there can be no doubt that allusion is here to "the great tribulation" (the same phrase, θλῖψις μεγάλη) of the last days, the birth-pangs of the new creation, which our Lord in his prophecy from the Mount had foretold.

Heb. xi., 10.—"He looked for *a* city which hath foundations." Not so; the language is singularly emphatic: "He looked for *the* city which hath *the* foundations" (τὴν τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν πόλιν), that is, the well-known and often alluded to foundations—in other words, he looked for the New Jerusalem, of which it had been already said, "Her *foundations* are in the holy mountains" (Psa. lxxxvii., 1; comp. Isa. xxviii., 16); even as in the Apocalypse great things are spoken of these glorious foundations of the heavenly city (Rev. xxi., 14, 19, 20). Let me here observe that those expositors seem to me to be wholly astray who make the apostle to say that Abraham looked forward to a period when the nomad life which he was now leading should cease, and his descendants be established in a well-ordered city, the earthly Jerusalem. He may, indeed, have looked on to that as a pledge of better things to come, but never to that as "the City having the foundations;" nor do I suppose for an instant that our translators at all intended this; but still, if they had reproduced the force of the article, they would, in giving the passage its true emphasis, have rendered such a misapprehension on the part of their readers well-nigh impossible.

John iii., 10.—"Art thou *a* teacher of Israel, and knowest not these things?" Middleton may perhaps make too much of ὁ διδάσκαλος here, as though it singled out Nicodemus from among all the Jewish doctors as the one supereminent. Yet it is equally incorrect to deny it all force. Christ, putting him to a wholesome shame, would make him feel how little the realities of his spiritual insight corresponded with the reputation which he enjoyed. "Art thou the teacher, the

famed teacher of Israel, and yet art ignorant of these things?" and the question loses an emphasis, which I can not but believe, with Winer and many more, it was intended to have, by the omission in our version of all notice of the article.

Acts xvii., 1.—"They came to Thessalonica, where was *a* synagogue of the Jews." Grotius gives well the force of ἡ συναγωγή here, which we have not preserved: "Articulus additus significat Philippis, Amphipoli et Apolloniæ nullas fuisse synagogas, sed si qui ibi essent Judæi, eos synagogam adiisse Thessalonicensem."

In other passages it is plain that a more complete mastery of the use of the article would have modified the rendering of a passage which our translators have given. It would have done so, I am persuaded, at 1 Tim. vi., 2: "And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren, but rather do them service, *because they are faithful and beloved, partakers of the benefit*" (ὅτι πιστοί εἰσι καὶ ἀγαπητοί, οἱ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι). It is clear that for them "partakers of the benefit" is but a farther unfolding of "faithful and beloved," the "benefit" being the grace and gift of eternal life, common to master and slave alike. But so the article in this last clause has not its rights, and the only correct translation of the passage will make πιστοὶ καὶ ἀγαπητοί the predicate, and οἱ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι the subject. St. Paul reminds the slaves that they shall serve believing masters the more cheerfully out of the consideration that they do not bestow their service on unconverted, unthankful lords, but rather that they who are "partakers of the benefit," that is, the benefit of their service, they to whom this service is rendered, are brethren in Christ. The Vulgate rightly: "quia fideles sunt et dilecti, qui beneficii participes sunt." It needs only to insert the words "who are" before "partakers" to make our version correct.

But more important than in any of these passages, as rendering serious doctrinal misunderstandings possible, is the neglect of the article at Rom. v., 15, 17. In place of any ob-

servations of my own, I will here quote Bentley's criticism on our version. Having found fault with the rendering of οἱ πολλοί, Rom. xii., 5, he proceeds: "This will enable us to clear up another place of much greater consequence, Rom. v., where, after the apostle had said, ver. 12, 'that by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed *upon all men* (εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους), for that all have sinned,' in the reddition of the sentence, ver. 15, he says, 'for if, through the offence *of one* (τοῦ ἑνὸς), *many* (οἱ πολλοὶ) be dead' (so our translators), 'much more the grace of God by *one man* (τοῦ ἑνὸς) Jesus Christ hath abounded *unto many*' (εἰς τοὺς πολλούς). Now who would not wish that they had kept the articles in the version which they saw in the original? 'If, through the offence of *the one*' (that is, Adam), '*the many* have died, much more the grace of God by *the one* man hath abounded unto *the many*.' By this accurate version some hurtful mistakes about partial redemption and absolute reprobation had been happily prevented. Our English readers had then seen, what several of the fathers saw and testified, that οἱ πολλοί, *the many*, in an antithesis to *the one*, are equivalent to πάντες, *all*, in ver. 12, and comprehend the whole multitude, the entire species of mankind, exclusive only of *the one*. So, again, ver. 18 and 19 of the same chapter, our translators have repeated the like mistake, where, when the apostle had said 'that as the offence of one was *upon all men* (εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους) to condemnation, so the righteousness of one was upon *all men* to justification; for,' adds he, 'as by the one man's (τοῦ ἑνὸς) disobedience *the many* (οἱ πολλοὶ) were made sinners, so by the obedience of *the one* (τοῦ ἑνὸς) *the many* (οἱ πολλοὶ) shall be made righteous.' By this version the reader is admonished and guided to remark that *the many*, in ver. 19, are the same as πάντες, *all*, in the 18th. But our translators, when they render it '*many* were made sinners, *many* were made righteous,' what do they do less than lead and draw their unwary readers into error?"*

* *A Sermon upon Popery. Works*, vol. iii., p. 245; comp. p. 129.

By far the most frequent fault with our translators is the omission of the article in the translation when it stands in the original; yet sometimes they fall into the converse error, and insert an article in the English where it does not stand in the Greek, and this too, it may be, not without injury to the sense and intention of the sacred writer. It is so at Rom. ii., 14, where we make St. Paul to say, "For when *the Gentiles*, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves." One might conclude from this that the apostle regarded such a fulfilling of the law on the part of the Gentiles as ordinary and normal. Yet it is not τὰ ἔθνη, but ἔθνη, and the passage must be rendered, "For when *Gentiles*, which have not the law, etc.," the apostle having in these words his eye on the small election of heathendom, the exceptions, and not the rule.

St. Paul has been sometimes charged with exaggeration in declaring that "the love of money is the root of all evil" (1 Tim. vi., 10); and there have been attempts to mitigate the strength of the assertion, as that when he said "*all* evil" he only meant "*much* evil." The help, however, does not lie here, but in more strictly observing what he does say. "The love of money," he declares, "is"—not "*the* root," but—"*a* root, of all evil." He does not affirm that this is *the* bitter root from which all evil springs, but *a* bitter root from which all evil *may* spring; there is no sin of which it may not be, as of which it has not been, the impulsive motive.

Acts xxvi., 2.—"The things whereof I am accused *of the Jews*." The insertion of the article in the English, where there is no article in the Greek, works still more injuriously here. St. Paul is made to account himself happy that he shall answer before King Agrippa of all things whereof he is "accused of the Jews." But he would not for an instant have affirmed or admitted that "*the* Jews" accused him; all true Jews, all who held fast the promises made to the fathers, and now fulfilled in Christ, were on his side. It is true that he is accused "of *Jews*," unfaithful members of the house of

Abraham, by no means "of *the* Jews." The force of ver. 7, in which our translators again make St. Paul to speak of being "accused *of the Jews*," is still more seriously impaired. He there puts before Agrippa, a Jewish proselyte, and therefore capable of understanding him, the monstrous, self-contradicting absurdity, that for cherishing and asserting the Messias-hope of his nation he should now be accused—not of heathens, that would have been nothing strange—but "of *Jews*," when that hope was indeed the central treasure of the whole Jewish nation. The point of this part of his speech is not that he is accused, but that it is Jews who accuse him. Before leaving this point, I may observe that "a Hebrew of Hebrews" (Phil. iii., 5), one, namely, of pure Hebrew blood and language (Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων), while it is more accurate, would tell also its own story much better than "a Hebrew of *the* Hebrews," as we have it now.

II. Our translators do not always seize the precise force of the prepositions. They have done so in the passages which follow:

John iv., 6.—Jesus therefore being wearied with his journey, sat thus *on* the well." It should be rather "*by* the well" (ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ, in its immediate neighborhood. On two other occasions, namely, Mark xiii., 29; John v., 2, they have rightly gone back from the more vigorous rendering of ἐπί with a dative, to which they have here adhered: comp. Exod. ii., 15, LXX.*

Rev. xv., 2.—"And I saw, as it were, a sea of glass mingled with fire; and them that had gotten the victory over the beast . . . . stand *on the sea of glass*, having the harps of God." It is easy to perceive the inducements which led our translators to render ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν τὴν ὑαλίνην "*on* the sea of glass;" yet much is lost thereby, namely, the whole allusion to the earlier triumph by the shores of the Red Sea, typical of this the final triumph of the Church, when the lit-

* Yet it ought to be said that Winer (*Gramm.*, § 52, c.) is on the side of our version as it stands.

eral Israel sang "the song of Moses" (Exod. xv., 1), a song which never grows old, for God is evermore triumphing gloriously, and which his saints are now at length taking up again. It is, as Bengel gives it rightly, "*by* the sea of glass" ("*ad* mare vitreum"), which "sea of glass" we are not to understand as a solid though diaphanous surface, *on which* these triumphant ones stood or could stand, but "*as it were* a sea of glass"—not a "glassen," but a "glassy" sea—a sea that might be compared to glass in its clearness and transparency. God's judgments, his government of the Church and the world, this is the great deep, the mystical sea (Psa. xxxvi., 7), on the shores of which his saints stand triumphantly at the end, while his enemies are swallowed up beneath its waves—"a sea as of glass," inasmuch as it is the visible utterance of his holiness, and shall at the last appear such, clear and transparent to all—but "as of glass *mingled with fire*," seeing that the wrath and indignation of God against sin, of which wrath fire is the standing symbol in Scripture, find their utterance, no less than his love, in the world's story.

Heb. vi., 7.—"Herbs meet for them *by whom* it is dressed." The translators give in the margin as an alternative "*for whom*." But it is no mere alternative; of δι' οὕς (not δι' ὧν) it is the only rendering which can be admitted. What actually stands in the text, besides being faulty in grammar, disturbs the spiritual image which underlies the passage. The heart of man is here the earth; man is the dresser; but the spiritual culture goes forward, not that the earth may bring forth that which is meet for him, the dresser *by* whom, but for God, the owner of the soil, *for* whom, it is dressed. The plural δι' οὕς, instead of δι' ὅν, need not trouble us, nor remove us from this, the only right interpretation. The earlier Latin version had it rightly; see Tertullian, *De Pudic.*, c. 20: "Terra enim quæ . . . . peperit herbam aptam his, *propter quos* et colitur, etc.;" but the Vulgate, "*a quibus*," anticipates our mistake, in which we only follow the English translations preceding.

Luke xxiii., 42.—"And he said unto him, Lord, remember me when thou comest *into thy kingdom.*" But how, it may be asked, could our Lord come *into* his kingdom when he is himself the centre of the kingdom, and brings the kingdom with him, so that where he is, there the kingdom must be? The passage will gain immensely when, leaving that strange and utterly unwarranted assumption that εἰς, a preposition of motion (whither), is convertible with ἐν, a preposition of rest (where), and thus that ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ, which stands here, is the same as εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν, we translate, "Lord, remember me when thou comest *in thy kingdom*," that is, "with all thy glorious kingdom about thee," as is so sublimely set forth, Rev. xix., 14; comp. Jude 14; 2 Thess. i., 7; Matt. xxv., 31 (ἐν τῇ δόξῃ). It is the stranger that our translators should have fallen into this error, seeing that they have translated ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ (Matt. xvi., 28) quite correctly: "coming *in his kingdom.*" The Vulgate also has "in regno tuo" there, although it shares the error of our translation, and has "in regnum tuum" here. The exegetical tact of Maldonatus overcomes on this, as on many other occasions, his respect for his "authentic" Vulgate, and he comments thus: "Itaque non est sensus, Cum veneris ad regnandum, sed, Cum venéris jam regnans, cum veneris non ad acquirendum regnum, sed regno jam acquisito, quemadmodum venturus ad judicium est." The same faulty rendering of ἐν, and assumption that it may have the force of εἰς, that ἐν χάριτι means the same as εἰς χάριν,* occurs Gal. i., 6; and indeed this, or the converse, in many other passages as well.†

* Some good words on this matter are found in Windischmann's Commentary on this Epistle, *in loco:* "ἐν χάριτι wird zumeist mit διὰ χάριτος, oder (mit Berufung auf Eph. iv., 4) εἰς χάριτα (Vulg., 'in gratiam') identisch genommen, ist aber significativer und bezeichnet, dass der Ruf nicht bloss *zur* Gnade Christi ergeht, sondern *in* der Gnade des Heilandes, d. h. der von ihm verdienten und von ihm als dem Haupte ausströmenden (Rom. v., 15) wurzelt, dass die Auserwählung der Berufenen in der Gnade des Auserwählter κατ' ἐξοχήν beschlossen ist (Eph. i., 4)."

† See Winer's *Gramm.*, § 54, 4, where he enters at length into the question whether εἰς is ever used for ἐν, or ἐν for εἰς, in the New Testament. Notwith-

2 Cor. xi., 3.—"But I fear lest . . . your minds should be corrupted *from the simplicity that is in Christ*" (ἀπὸ τῆς ἁπλότητος τῆς εἰς τὸν Χριστόν). Here again the injurious supposition that εἰς and ἐν may be confounded has been at work, and to serious loss in the bringing out of the meaning of the passage. The ἁπλότης here is the simple, undivided affection, the singleness of heart of the Bride, the Church, εἰς Χριστόν, *toward* Christ. It is not their "simplicity *in Christ*," or Christian simplicity, which the apostle fears lest they may, through addiction to worldly wisdom, forfeit and let go; but, still moving in the images of espousals and marriage, that they may not bring a simple undivided heart *to* Christ. If after ἁπλότητος we should also read καὶ τῆς ἁγνότητος, which seems probable, it will then be clearer still what St. Paul's intention was.

2 Pet. i., 5–7.—"Add *to* your faith virtue, and *to* virtue knowledge, and *to* knowledge temperance, and *to* temperance patience, and *to* patience godliness, etc." (ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν, κ.τ.λ.). Tyndale had rendered the passage, "*In* your faith minister virtue, and *in* your virtue knowledge," etc., and all translations up to the Authorized had followed him. Henry More* has well expressed the objection to the present version: "Grotius would have ἐν to be redundant here, so that his suffrage is for the English translation. But, for my own part, I think that ἐν is so far from being redundant that it is essential to the sentence, and interposed that we might understand a greater mystery than the mere adding of so many virtues one to another, which would be all that could be expressly signified if ἐν were left out. But the preposition here signifying causality, there is more than a mere enumeration of those divine graces; for

standing the original identity of the two prepositions, εἰς being only another form of ἐν, and the many passages which *seem* to make for their indiscriminate use, as Matt. x., 16; Luke vii., 17; Matt. ii., 23; John ix., 7; or, again, the comparison of Matt. xxi., 8 with Mark xi., 8, or Mark i., 16 with Matt. iv., 18, he affirms that in one the sense of motion is always inherent, in the other of rest.

* *On Godliness*, b. viii., c. 3.

there is also implied how naturally they rise one out of another, and that they have a causal dependence one of another." See this same thought beautifully carried out in detail by Bengel, *in loco.*

III. Our translators do not always give the true force of tenses, moods, and voices.

Oftentimes the present tense is used in the New Testament, especially by St. John in the Apocalypse, to express the eternal Now of him for whom there can be no past and no future. It must be considered a fault when this is let go, and exchanged for a past tense in our version. Take, for instance, Rev. iv., 5: "Out of the throne *proceeded* lightnings, and thunderings, and voices." But it is much more than this; not merely at that one moment when St. John beheld, but evermore out of his throne *proceed* (ἐκπορεύονται) these symbols of the presence and of the terrible majesty of God. Throughout this chapter, and at chapter i., 14–16, there is often a needless, and sometimes an absolutely incorrect, turning of the present of eternity into the past of time.

Elsewhere a past is turned without cause into a present. It is so at Acts xxviii., 4: "No doubt this man is a murderer, whom, though he hath escaped the sea, yet Vengeance *suffereth not* to live." A fine turn in the exclamation of these barbarous islanders has been missed in our version, and in all the English versions except the Geneva. The βάρβαροι, the "natives," as I think the word might have been fairly translated, who must have best known the qualities of the vipers then existing on the island, are so confident of the deadly character of that one which has fastened itself on Paul's hand, that they regard and speak of him as one *already dead*, and in this sense use a past tense; he is one whom "Vengeance *suffered not* (οὐκ εἴασεν) to live." Bengel: "*Non sivit;* jam nullum putant esse Paulum;" De Wette: "nicht hat leben lassen." Let me observe here, by the way, that our modern editions of the Bible should not have dropped the capital V with which "Vengeance" was spelt in the ex-

emplar edition of 1611. These islanders, in their simple but most truthful moral instincts, did not contemplate "Vengeance," or Δίκη, in the abstract, but personified her as a goddess; and our translators, who are by no means prodigal of their capitals, in their manner of spelling the word, did their best to mark and reproduce this personification of the divine Justice, although the carelessness of printers has since let it go.

Elsewhere there is confusion between the uses of the present and the perfect. There is such, for example, at Luke xviii., 12: "I give tithes of all that I *possess*." But ὅσα κτῶμαι is not "all that I *possess*," but "all that I *acquire*" ("quæ mihi acquiro, quæ mihi redeunt"). The Vulgate, which has "possideo," shares, perhaps suggested, our error. In the perfect κέκτημαι the word first obtains the force of "I possess," or, in other words, "I *have acquired*."* The Pharisee would boast himself to be, so to say, another Jacob, such another as he who had said, "Of all that *thou shalt give me*, I will surely give the tenth unto thee" (Gen. xxviii., 22; comp. xiv., 20), a careful performer of that precept of the law which said, "Thou shalt truly tithe all the increase of thy seed, that the field bringeth forth year by year" (Deut. xiv., 22); but change "acquire" into "possess," and how much of this we lose.

We must associate with this passage another, namely, Luke xxi., 19: "In your patience *possess ye* your souls;" for the same correction ought there to find place. It is rather, "In your patience *make ye* your souls your own"—that is, "In and by your patience or endurance *acquire* your souls as something which you may indeed call your own" ("salvas obtinete"). Thus Winer: "Durch Ausdauer erwerbt euch eure Seelen; sie werden dann erst euer wahres, unverlierbares Eigenthum werden." It is noticeable that our translators have corrected the "possess" of all the preceding versions at Matt. x., 9, exchanging this for the more accurate "provide" (κτήσησθε), or, as it is in the margin, "get," which

* See Winer, *Gramm.*, § 41, 4.

makes it strange that they should have allowed it in these other places to stand.

Imperfects lose their proper force, and are dealt with as aorists and perfects. The vividness of the narration often suffers from the substitution of the pure historic for what may be called the descriptive tense; as, for example, at Luke xiv., 7: "He put forth a parable to those that were bidden when he marked how they *chose out* the chief rooms." Read, "how they *were choosing out* (ἐξελέγοντο) the chief rooms"—the sacred historian placing the Lord's utterance of the parable in the midst of the events which he is describing. So Acts iii., 1: "Now Peter and John *went up* together into the Temple." Read, "*were going up*" (ἀνέβαινον). Again, Mark ii., 18: "And the disciples of John and of the Pharisees *used to fast.*" Read, "*were fasting*" (ἦσαν νηστεύοντες), namely, at that very time, which gives a special vigor to their remonstrances; they were keeping a fast while the Lord's disciples were celebrating a festival. The incomplete *imperfect* sense, which so often belongs to this tense, and from which it derives its name, they often fail to give; the commencement of a work which is not brought to a conclusion, the consent and co-operation of another party, which was necessary for its completion, having been withheld; in such cases the will is taken for the deed.* Thus Luke i., 59: "And they *called* him Zacharias." It is not so, for Elizabeth would not allow this name to be given him; but with the true force of the incomplete imperfect tense: "And they *were calling* (ἐκάλουν) him Zacharias." Once more, Luke v., 6: "And their net *brake.*" Had this been so, they would scarcely have secured the fishes at all. Rather, "was in the act of breaking," or "was at the point to break" (διερρήγνυτο). Other passages where they do not give the force of the imperfect, but deal with it as though it had been a perfect or an aorist, are John iii., 22; iv., 47; vi., 21; Luke xxiv., 32; Matt. xiii., 34; Acts xi., 20.

* See Jelf's *Kühner's Grammar*, § 398, 2.

Aorists are rendered as if they were perfects, and perfects as if they were aorists. Thus we have an example of the first, Luke i., 19, where ἀπεστάλην is translated as though it were ἀπέσταλμαι, "I *am* sent," instead of "I *was* sent." Gabriel contemplates his mission, not at the moment of its present fulfillment, but from that of his first sending forth from the presence of God. Another example of the same occurs at 2 Pet. i., 14: "Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ *hath showed* me." By this "*hath* showed me" we lose altogether the special allusion to an historic moment in the apostle's life, to John xxi., 18, 19, which would at once come out if ἐδήλωσέ μοι had been rendered "showed me." Doubtless there are passages which would make difficult the universal application of the rule that perfects should be translated as perfects, and aorists as aorists: thus Luke xiv., 18, 19, where one might hesitate in rendering ἠγόρασα "I *bought*" instead of "I *have bought*;" and some at least in the long line of aorists, ἐδόξασα ἐτελείωσα, ἐφανέρωσα, ἔλαβον (ver. 4, 6, 8), in the high-priestly prayer, John xvii. Still, on these passages no conclusion can be grounded that the writers of the New Testament did not always observe the distinction.*

Again, the force of the aorist is missed, though in another way, at Mark xvi., 2, where ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου is translated "*at the rising* of the sun." It can only be "when the sun *was risen*." Did the anxiety to avoid a slight seeming discrepancy between this statement and that of two other evangelists (Matt. xxviii., 1; John xx., 1) modify the translation here?

Examples, on the other hand, of perfects turned into aorists are frequent. Thus, at Luke xiii., 2: "Suppose ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because *they suffered* such things?" Rather, "because *they have suffered* (πεπόνθασιν) such things." Our Lord contemplates the catastrophe in which they perished, not as something belonging

* See Winer, *Gramm.*, § 41, 5.

merely to the historic past, but as a fact reaching into the present, still vividly presenting itself to the mind's eye of his hearers.

One other example must suffice. In that great doctrinal passage, Col. i., 13–22, St. Paul declares, ver. 16, that "by Christ *were* all things *created*." The aorist ἐκτίσθη has its right force given to it here; but the apostle in a most remarkable way, when in the last clause of the verse he resumes the doctrine of the whole, changes the aorist ἐκτίσθη for the perfect ἔκτισται. And why? Because he is no longer looking at the one historic act of creation, but at the permanent results flowing on into all time and eternity therefrom. Our translators have not followed him here, but, as if no change had been made, they render this clause also, "All things *were created* by him and for him," but read rather, "All things *have been created* by him and for him."*

Imperfects and aorists are turned without necessity into pluperfects. It is admitted by all that an aorist, under certain conditions, may have this sense of a past behind another past;† nor, according to some, can this force be altogether denied to the imperfect; but a pluperfect force is given in our version to these tenses where certainly no sort of necessity requires it. Thus, for the words, "because *he had done* these things on the Sabbath" (John v., 16), read, "because *he did* (ἐποίει) these things on the Sabbath." And, again, in the same chapter read, "for Jesus *conveyed himself away*" (ἐξένευσεν); that is, as soon as this discussion between the Jews and the healed man arose, not "*had conveyed himself away*" previously, as our version would imply.

Neither do our translators always give its right force to a middle verb. They fail to do so at Phil. ii., 15: "Among

* The fact that we almost all learn our grammar from the Latin, and that in the Latin the perfect indicative does its own duty and that of the aorist as well, renders us very inobservant of inaccuracies in this particular kind till we have been specially trained to observe them.

† What these conditions are, see Winer's *Gramm.*, § 41, 5.

whom *ye shine* as lights in the world." To justify this "*ye shine*," which is common to all the versions of the English Hexapla, St. Paul ought to have written φαίνετε, and not φαίνεσθε, as he has written. Φαίνειν, indeed, is "to shine" (John i., 5; 2 Pet. i., 19; Rev. i., 16), but φαίνεσθαι "to appear" (Matt. xxiii., 27; 1 Pet. iv., 18; James iv., 14). It is worthy of note, that while the Vulgate, having "lucetis," shares and anticipates our error, an earlier Italic version was free from it, as is evident from the verse as quoted by Augustine (*Enarr. in Psa.* exlvi., 4): "In quibus *apparetis* tanquam luminaria in mundo."

Sometimes the force of a passive is lost. Thus is it at 2 Cor. v., 10: "For we must all *appear* before the judgment seat of Christ." The words contain a yet more solemn and awful announcement than this: "For we must all *be made manifest*" (πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ), exhibited as what we indeed are, displayed in our true colors, the secrets of our hearts disclosed, and we, so to speak, *turned inside out* (for the word means nothing less) "before the judgment seat of Christ." There is often reason to think that the exposition of Chrysostom exercised considerable influence on our translators. Here it might have done so with benefit; for, commenting on these words (*in Cor. Hom.*, 10), he says: οὐ γὰρ παραστῆναι ἡμᾶς ἁπλῶς δεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ φανερωθῆναι, showing that he would not have been satisfied with what our translators have here done.

With one or two miscellaneous observations I will conclude this chapter. It would be very impertinent to suppose that our translators, who numbered in their company many of the first scholars of their time, were not perfectly at home in the use of πᾶς, and familiar with the very simple modifications of its meaning as employed with or without an article, and yet it must be owned that they do not always observe its rules. One example may suffice.

Acts x., 12.—"Wherein were *all manner of four-footed beasts* of the earth." But πάντα τὰ τετράποδα can not possibly

have the meaning ascribed to it here. Translate rather, "Wherein were *all the four-footed beasts* of the earth"—"omnia animalia," as the Vulgate rightly has it. Here probably, as Winer observes, they were tempted to forsake the more accurate rendering from an unwillingness to ascribe something which seemed to them like exaggeration to the sacred historian: how, they said to themselves, could "all the four-footed beasts of the earth" be contained in that sheet? For, indeed, this shrinking from a meaning which an accurate translation would render up is a very frequent occasion of mistranslation, and also of warped exegesis. It is much better, however, that the translator should go forward on *his* task without regard to such considerations as these. The Word of God can take care of, and vindicate itself, and does not need to be thus taken under man's protection.*

It is remarkable how little careful our translators are to note the difference between the verb of *being* and that of *becoming;* between εἰμί and γέγονα. I do not indeed think it possible to carry out the distinction between εἶναι and γίνεσθαι in every instance without occasional awkwardnesses of translation: it seems to me that Professor Ellicott has not quite escaped these, Ephes. v., 7, 17; and that we must recognize at times a certain idiomatic use of γίνου and γίνεσθε, best represented by "be" and "be ye." Still the passages are numerous where the words can not be confounded, as our trans-

* There are some good observations on this matter in Laurence Humphrey's excellent treatise *Interpretatio Linguarum, seu de ratione convertendi auctores tam sacros quam profanos.* Basileæ, 1559. He is finding fault with those who, in translating, seek to mitigate such expressions as the σκληρύνει of Rom. ix., 18, παρέδωκε of Rom. i., 24, εἰσενέγκῃς of Matt. vi., 13, and says, "Non est locus hic interpretationibus nostro Marte et ingenio confictis, cum se Spiritus Sanctus exponit, optimus magister interpretandi, cujus linguam fas non est homini mutare aut temperare. Satis molliter loquitur, qui cum illo dure loquitur. Explicationis varietas relinquatur cuivis libera. *Interpres hanc libertatem si tollat, bono jure non tollit, sed lectori facit injuriam.*" And elsewhere, against some who rendered the παρέδωκε above referred to, "permisit," he observes, "Non est durum quod Spiritus Sanctus putarit non esse durum, nec frigidis hominum temperamentis sermo divinus modificandus," p. 174.

lators have confounded them, without loss. Thus, at Heb. v., 11, the apostle complains of the difficulty of unfolding some hard truths to those whom he addresses, "seeing ye *are* dull of hearing." But the rebuke is sharper than this—"seeing ye *have become* dull of hearing" (ἐπεὶ νωθροὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς). This would imply that it was not so once, in the former days, when they first were enlightened (x., 32), but that now they had gone back from that liveliness of spiritual apprehension which once had been theirs (see Chrysostom). The Vulgate has it rightly: "Quoniam imbecilles *facti estis* ad audiendum;" being followed by the Rheims: "Because ye are *become* weak to hear;" so, too, De Wette: "Da ihr träge von Verstande *geworden seid*." Compare the next verse, where γεγόνατε again occurs, and where the force of it *is* given. At Matt. xxiv., 32, there is the same loss of the true force of the word. Not the *being* tender of the branch of the fig-tree, but the *becoming* tender, that is, through the returning sap of spring, is the sign of the nearness of summer.

Nor are the occasions wanting when the maintenance of the distinction is far more important, as at John viii., 58. They make no attempt to preserve there the antithesis, dogmatically so important, between Abraham's *birth* in time, and Christ's *subsistence* through eternity (πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγώ εἰμι). How this should have been effected may be a question; whether as Cranmer has done it, "Ere Abraham was born, I am," or as the Rhemish, "Before that Abraham was made, I am," or by some other device; but in some form or other it should assuredly have been attempted. In the Vulgate, "Antequam Abraham *fieret*, ego *sum*."*

In other points our translators are without fault, where yet the modern copies, by careless reproduction of their work, involve them in apparent error, which indeed is none of theirs,

* Sydenham (*The Arraignment of the Arian*, p. 93) puts it well: "*Was* points only to a human constitution; *I am* to a divine substance [qy., subsistence]; and therefore the original hath a γενέσθαι for Abraham, and an εἰμί for Christ."

but that of the too careless guardians of their text. They have their own burden to bear; they ought not to be made to bear the burden of others; but they do so in more places than one. Thus, at Matt. xii., 23, correcting all our previous translations, they gave the words *μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαβίδ*; with perfect accuracy: "Is this the Son of David?" fully understanding that, according to the different idioms of the Greek and English, the negative particle of the original was not to reappear in the English; comp. Acts vii., 42; John viii., 22; xviii., 35. I am unable to say at what time the reading which appears in nearly all our modern Bibles, "Is *not* this the Son of David?" first crept in; it is already in Hammond, 1659; but it is little creditable to those who should have kept their text inviolate, that they have not exercised a stricter vigilance over it. It is curious that, having escaped error here, our translators should yet have fallen into it in the exactly similar phrase at John iv., 29, *μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός*; where they *do* render "Is *not* this the Christ?" but should have rendered "Is this the Christ?" or "Can this be the Christ?" The Samaritan woman, in her joy, as speaking of a thing too good to be true, which she will suggest, but dare not absolutely affirm, asks of her fellow-countrymen, "Is this the Christ?—can this be he whom we have looked for so long?"—expecting in reply, not a negative, but an affirmative answer.

Let me take this occasion of observing that elsewhere we have to complain of a like carelessness. Thus there are passages in which the punctuation of the exemplar edition of 1611 gave an accurate rendering, while the subsequent abandonment of that punctuation lends an appearance of incorrectness to our version from which it is really free. Thus, in modern editions, we read at John xviii., 3, "Judas then, having received a band of men and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees, cometh." This would make the traitor to have received the "band of men" *and* the "officers" alike from the chief priests and Pharisees. Such was not the case; the

"band of men" were the Roman soldiers, whom he received from the Roman authorities, while the "officers" only, or officials, as we should now say, he received from the chief priests and Pharisees. In the original edition there was a comma after "band of men," which has subsequently been dropped, and then all was correct.

Being on this subject, I will call attention to another passage where the original punctuation has been abandoned. It is Heb. xii., 23. All who have critically studied this epistle know that, in respect of this verse and that preceding, there is a much-debated question how the different clauses should be divided. Now I do not undertake to affirm that our translators were right, though there is much to say for the scheme of the passage which they evidently favor; but when they punctuated this verse as follows, "To the general assembly, and Church of the first-born which are written in heaven," they meant something different from that which the verse as it is now punctuated, "To the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven," means; and their punctuation should not have been disturbed. The disturbing of it is, in fact, an unacknowledged revision of the translation.

## CHAPTER IX.

### ON SOME QUESTIONABLE RENDERINGS OF WORDS.

THERE are a certain number of passages in which no one can charge our translators with error, the version they have given being entirely defensible, and numbering among its upholders some, it may be many, well worthy to be heard; while yet another version, on the whole, will commend itself as preferable to that which they have adopted. I shall proceed to adduce a few such passages, where, to me at least, it seems there is a higher probability, in some a far higher, in favor of some other translation rather than of that which they have admitted.

Matt. vi., 27; comp. Luke xii., 25.—"Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his *stature?*" Erasmus was, I believe, the first who suggested that ἡλικία here was not "stature," but "length of life." With him it was no more than a suggestion; but it has since found acceptance with many, with Hammond, Wolf, Wetstein, Olshausen, Meyer, and others. While the present translation may be abundantly justified—Fritzsche stands out for it still—yet this certainly appears far preferable to me, and for the following reasons: α. In that natural rhetoric of which our Lord was the great master, he would not have named a cubit, which is about a foot and a half, but some very small measure, and reminded his hearers that they could not add even this to their stature. It would have scarcely been in the spirit of this rhetoric to ask, "Which of you with all his caring can make himself a *foot* taller than God has made him?" Rather Christ would have demanded, "Which of you with all his anxious care can add an inch or a hair's breadth (ἐλάχιστον, Luke xii., 26) to his stature?" β. Men do not practically take thought

about adding to their stature; it is not an object of anxiety to one in a thousand to be taller than God has made him; this could scarcely, therefore, be cited as one of the vain solicitudes of men. γ. On the other hand, every thing exactly fits when we understand our Lord to be asking this question about life and the possibility of adding the least fraction to its length. The cubit, which is much when compared with a man's stature, is infinitesimally little, and therefore most appropriate when compared to his length of life, that life being contemplated as a course, or δρόμος (2 Tim. iv., 7), which he may attempt, but ineffectually, to prolong. δ. And then, farther, this prolonging of life is something which men do seek, striving by various precautions, by solicitous care, to lengthen the period of their mortal existence, to which yet they can not add so much as a single cubit more than has been apportioned to it by God.

Luke ii., 49.—"Wist ye not that I must be *about my Father's business?*" But ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Πατρός will as well mean "in my Father's house;" and if the words will mean this as well, they will surely mean it better. We shall thus have a more direct answer on the part of the child Jesus to the implied rebuke of his blessed mother's words, "Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing;" to which he answers, "How is it that ye sought me?"—that is, in any other place? "Wist ye not that I must be *in my Father's house*—here in the Temple? and here, without lengthened seeking, ye might have found me at once." There was a certain misconception in respect of his person and character which had led them to look for him in other places of resort rather than in the Temple.

John xii., 6.—"He was a thief, and had the bag, and *bare* what was put therein." I can not but think that it was St. John's intention to say not merely that Judas "bare," but that he "bare *away*," purloined, or pilfered what was put into the common purse. It seems a tautology to say that he "had the bag, and *bare* what was put therein," unless indeed it is

said that the latter clause was introduced to explain the *opportunities* which he enjoyed of playing the thief; hardly, as it appears to me, a sufficient justification. On the other hand, the use of *βαστάζειν*, not in the sense of "portare," but of "auferre," is frequent; it is so used by Josephus, *Antiq.* xiv., 7, 1, and in the New Testament, John xx., 15, and such, I am persuaded, is the use of it here. We note that already, in Augustine's time, the question had arisen which was the right way to deal with the words; for, commenting on the "portabat" which he found in his Italic, as it has kept its place in the Vulgate, he asks, "Portabat, an exportabat? Sed ministerio portabat, furto exportabat." Here he might seem to leave his own interpretation of the passage undecided; not so, however, at *Ep.* 108, 3: "Ipsi [apostoli] de illo scripserunt quod fur erat, et omnia quæ mittebantur de dominicis loculis *auferebat.*" After all is said, there will probably always remain upholders of one translation and upholders of the other, yet to my mind the probabilities are much in favor of that version which I observe that the "Five Clergymen" have also adopted.

Acts xvii., 18.—"What will this *babbler* say?" "Babbler" here is very well, and yet I can not but feel that "chatterer" is *the* word. It unites by a singular felicity the two meanings that meet in *σπερμολόγος*, being, like it, at once the name of a bird, and a name given to a slight idle talker. *Σπερμολόγος* is properly a little bird, so called from its gathering up of seeds. It is then by transfer, 1st, a mean person, who gets his living somewhat as this bird does, haunts corn-markets and other places of resort for the gathering up of the offals and leavings there—like Autolycus, "a picker up of unconsidered trifles;" 2dly, one who idly chatters as this bird does. Some lines of Shakespeare so curiously illustrate this *σπερμολόγος*, even to the image on which the word rests, that I can not resist quoting them. Of a slight talkative person it is said,

> "This fellow pecks up wit as pigeons peas,
> And utters it again when God doth please.

> He is wit's peddler, and retails his wares
> At wakes and wassails, meetings, markets, fairs."*

At the same time, it must always remain a question whether, leaving this of babbling or chattering altogether out, "paltry fellow," or "base fellow," as in our margin, would not better express the intention of the word.† The curious and barbarous "seminiverbius" of the Vulgate, which reappears as "word-sower" in the Rhemish, rests evidently on a misreading of the word. It should be σπειρολόγος—though indeed λογοσπόρος is the form which the word must have assumed to justify this.

Rom. i., 26, 27.—I speak with hesitation, yet incline strongly to think that in this awful passage, where St. Paul dares to touch on two of the worst enormities of the heathen world, and with purest lips to speak, and that with all necessary plainness, of the impurest things, we should have done well if we had followed even to the utmost where he would lead us. For "men" and "women," as often as the words occur in these verses, I should wish to see substituted "males" and "females;" ἄρσενες and θήλειαι are throughout the words which St. Paul employs. It is true that something must be indulged to the delicacy of modern Christian ears; our translators have evidently so considered in dealing with more than one passage in the Old Testament; but, reading these verses over with this substitution, while they gain in emphasis, while they represent more exactly the terrible charge which St. Paul brings against the cultivated world of heathendom, they do not seem to me to acquire any such painful explicitness as they ought not to have, hardly more of this than they possessed before.

* *Love's Labor's Lost*, Act v., sc. 1.

† See an excellent article on σπερμολόγος in Suicer's *Thesaurus*. It is to this conclusion that Boisius, in a learned note in his able work, *Veteris Interpretis cum Bezâ aliisque Recentioribus Collatio*, p. 428, arrives: "Paulus σπερμολόγος audit a philosophis Atheniensibus non ut locutuleius aut blaterator aliquis, sed ut homo tenuissimæ fortunæ, parumque splendide vestitus. Est enim convicium in viles potius quam verbosos."

1 Cor. xiii., 12.—"For now we see *through* a glass (δι' ἐσόπτρου), darkly." I can not but think that, for the avoiding of misconception, it would have been preferable, "For now we see *by* a glass, darkly," marking so that διά is here instrumental. For what is the natural conclusion of every one who, without reference to the Greek, hears or reads the words as they now stand? What can it be but that they express an imperfect seeing *through* some dim, only semi-transparent medium, as talc, horn, crystal, lapis specularis, or the like, such as did for the ancients that service which glass now so much better accomplishes for us? This, however, it is needless to say, would be δίοπτρα or δίοπτρον, while ἔσοπτρον (=κάτοπτρον) can mean only a looking-glass; and when we remember the polished metallic mirrors, which were the only ones which antiquity knew, and the dim, obscure ἀπαύγασμα, which was all that they could have given back, we shall feel the exquisite fitness of this image, both in respect of the indistinctness of the seeing, and in respect of its being, as is well said in the passage which follows, "no immediate vision." That citation is drawn from an old English divine, less known than he deserves, and is much to the point: "Some that would be more critical than they need would fain show us a difference between ἔσοπτρον and κάτοπτρον. Κάτοπτρον indeed with them is a looking-glass, but ἔσοπτρον is some other glass; either such a one as is for the help of weak and aged eyes, and then 'tis, we see through spectacles; or else such as presents the object though afar off, and so 'tis, we see through a perspective. The Vulgar Latin, *that* will have it *per transennam*, 'through a lattice,' as the Spouse in the Canticles is said to flourish through the lattices. And all these urge the force of the preposition δι' ἐσόπτρου, we see *through* a glass or *through* a lattice. But they might easily know that δι' ἐσόπτρου here is the same as ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ; and though it be true that κάτοπτρον be the more usual word for a looking-glass, yet it is true that ἔσοπτρον signifies the same. Hesychius makes them synonymous, and the word is but

once more used in the New Testament, James i., 23, and there can be no doubt that there 'tis taken for a looking-glass. Well, then, our dark, imperfect knowledge of God here is thus set forth by seeing in a glass, because it is no immediate vision; the object is not primarily and immediately presented to the eye, but by way of resultancy and *mediante speculo*, by the conveyance of the looking-glass, which is a silent interpreter of the object. And such is our knowledge of God here, and such our communion with him; only some broken beams of glory, some glimpses of his presence scattered here and there, in this ordinance and in that—glasses of his own making, means of his proper institution."*

2 Cor. ii., 14.—"Now thanks be unto God, which always *causeth us to triumph* in Christ." Here, too, our translators may be right, and, if they are wrong, it is in good company. I must needs think that for "causeth us to triumph" we should read "leadeth us in triumph;" and that the Vulgate, when it rendered θριαμβεύων ἡμᾶς "qui triumphat nos," and Jerome (which is the same thing) "qui triumphat de nobis," though even he has failed to bring out his meaning with clearness, were right. Θριαμβεύειν occurs but on one other occasion in the New Testament (Col. ii., 15). No one there doubts that it means "to lead in triumph," "to make a show of," as vanquished and subdued; and it is hard to withdraw this meaning from it here, being as it also is the only meaning of the word in classical Greek; thus Plutarch, *Thes. et Rom.*, iv.: βασιλεῖς ἐθριάμβευσε καὶ ἡγεμόνας, "he led kings and captains in triumph;" and see other examples in Wetstein. But, it may be asked, what will St. Paul mean by the declaration "who every where leadeth us in triumph in Christ?" The meaning is, indeed, a very grand one. St. Paul did not feel it inconsistent with the profoundest humility to regard himself as a signal trophy and token of God's victorious power in Christ. Lying with his face upon the ground, he had anticipated, though in another sense, the words of another

* Culverwell, *Spiritual Opticks*, p. 173.

fighter against God, "Vicisti, Galilæe;" and now his Almighty Conqueror was leading him about through all the cities of the Greek and Roman world, an illustrious testimony of his power at once to subdue and to save. The foe of Christ was now, as he gloried in naming himself, the servant of Christ, and this, his mighty transformation, God was making manifest to the glory of his name in every place. The attempt of some to combine the meanings of "being led in triumph," which they feel that the word demands, and "triumphing," or "being made to triumph," which it seems to them the sense demands, is in my judgment an attempt to reconcile irreconcilable images; as, for instance, when Stanley says, "The sense of conquest and degradation is lost in the more general sense of 'making us to share this triumph.'" But in the literal triumph, who so pitiable, so abject, so forlorn as the captive chief or king, the Jugurtha or Vercingetorix, doomed often, as soon as he had graced the show, to a speedy and miserable death? But it is not with God as with man; for while to be led in triumph of men is the most miserable, to be led in triumph of God, as the willing trophy of his power, is the most glorious and blessed lot which could fall to any; and it is this, I am persuaded, which the apostle claims for his own.

2 Cor. ii., 17.—"For we are not as many, *which corrupt* the Word of God." Doubtless there is much to be said in favor of this version of καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καπηλεύειν is often to "adulterate," νοθεύειν, as Chrysostom expounds it, "to mingle false with true," as the κάπηλος, or petty huckster, would frequently do. Still the matter is by no means so clear in favor of this meaning of καπηλεύειν, and against the other, "to make a traffic of," as some in later times would have it; and the words ἐξ εἰλικρινείας, which Meyer conceives decisive, seem to me rather an argument the other way. What so natural as that St. Paul should put back the charge of making a traffic with the Word of God; above all, seeing how earnestly elsewhere in this epistle he clears himself from

similar charges (xii., 14, 17)? I believe, when Tyndale rendered καπηλεύειν here, "to chop and change with," he was on the right track; and many will remember the remarkable passage in Bentley's *Sermon upon Popery*, which is so strong in this view that, long as it is, I can not forbear to quote it: "Our English translators have not been very happy in their version of this passage. We are not, says the apostle, καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, which our translators have rendered 'We do not corrupt' or (as in the margin) deal deceitfully with 'the Word of God.' They were led to this by the parallel place, c. iv. of this epistle, ver. 2, 'not walking in craftiness,' μηδὲ δολοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, 'nor handling the Word of God deceitfully;' they took καπηλεύοντες and δολοῦντες in the same adequate notion, as the vulgar Latin had done before them, which expresses both by the same word, *adulterantes* verbum Dei; and so, likewise, Hesychius makes them synonyms, ἐκκαπηλεύειν, δολοῦν. Δολοῦν, indeed, is fitly rendered adulterare; so δολοῦν τὸν χρυσὸν, τὸν οἶνον, to adulterate gold or wine by mixing worse ingredients with the metal or liquor. And our translators had done well if they had rendered the latter passage, not adulterating, not sophisticating the Word. But καπηλεύοντες in our text has a complex idea and a wider signification; καπηλεύειν always comprehends δολοῦν, but δολοῦν never extends to καπηλεύειν, which, besides the sense of adulterating, has an additional notion of unjust lucre, gain, profit, advantage. This is plain from the word κάπηλος, a calling always infamous for avarice and knavery: perfidus hic caupo, says the poet, as a general character. Thence καπηλεύειν, by an easy and natural metaphor, was diverted to other expressions where cheating and lucre were signified: καπηλεύειν τὸν λόγον, says the apostle here, and the ancient Greeks, καπηλεύειν τὰς δίκας, τὴν εἰρήνην, τὴν σοφίαν, τὰ μαθήματα, to corrupt and sell justice, to barter a negotiation of peace, to prostitute learning and philosophy for gain. Cheating, we see, and adulterating is part of the notion of καπηλεύειν, but the principal essential of it is sordid lucre.

So cauponari in the famous passage of Ennius, where Pyrrhus refuses the offer of a ransom for his captives, and restores them gratis:

> "'Non mi aurum posco, nec mi pretium dederitis,
> Non cauponanti bellum, sed belligeranti.'

And so the fathers expound this place. . . . So that, in short, what St. Paul says, καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον, might be expressed in one classic word—λογέμποροι, or λογοπρᾶται, where the idea of gain and profit is the chief part of the signification. Wherefore, to do justice to our text, we must not stop lamely with our translators, 'corrupters of the Word of God,' but add to it as its plenary notion, 'corrupters of the Word of God *for filthy lucre*.'"*

Col. ii., 8.—"Beware lest any man *spoil you* through philosophy and vain deceit." This translation may very well hold its place: συλαγωγεῖν does mean to rob or spoil; this, however, is its secondary meaning; its first, and that which agrees with its etymology (σῦλον and ἄγω), would be, "to lead away the spoil," "prædam abigere;" and certainly the warning would be more emphatic if we understood it as a warning lest they should become themselves the spoil or booty of these false teachers: "Beware lest any man *make a booty of you*, lead you away as his spoil, through philosophy and vain deceit." Bengel: "συλαγωγῶν, qui non solum *de vobis*, sed *vos ipsos* spolium faciat."

Col. ii., 23.—"Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body, *not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh*." The first part of this verse, itself not very easy, appears to me to be excellently rendered in our version. Perhaps, were it to do again, instead of "a *show* of wisdom," "a *reputation* of wisdom" would more exactly express λόγον σοφίας; and there may be a question whether "neglecting" is quite strong enough for ἀφειδία, whether "punishing" or "not sparing," which are both suggested in the margin, would not, one or the other,

* *Works*, vol. iii., p. 242.

have been well introduced into the text. But in the latter part of the verse, where its chief difficulties reside, our translators leave us in some doubt as regards the exact meaning which the passage had for them. About the Geneva Version I have no doubt. Its authors, evidently under the leading of Beza, have seized the right meaning: "[yet are] of no value, [but appertain to those things] wherewith the flesh is crammed." At the same time, their version is too paraphrastic, the words which I have inclosed within brackets having no corresponding words in the original. Did our translators mean the same thing? I am inclined to think not, else they would have placed a comma after "honor;" but that rather they, in agreement with many of the best interpreters of their time, understood the verse thus: "Which things have a show of wisdom, etc., but are not in any true honor, as things which serve to the satisfying of the just needs of the body." If this be, as I feel pretty sure it is, their meaning, there may be urged against it that πλησμονή has a constant sense of filling *overmuch*, or stuffing (Isa. i., 14; Psa. cv., 16; Ezek. xvi., 49); and followed by σαρκός, could scarcely have any other sense; it being impossible that σάρξ here can be used in an honorable intention and as equivalent to σῶμα, but only in the constant Pauline sense of the flesh and mind of the flesh as opposed to the spirit. Some rendering which should express what the Geneva Version expresses, but in happier and conciser terms, is that which should be aimed at here. "A golden sentence," as he calls it, which Bengel quotes from the Commentary of Hilary the Deacon on this passage, "Sagina carnalis sensûs traditio humana est," shows that this interpretation of it was not unknown in antiquity.

1 Tim. vi., 8.—"Having food and *raiment*, let us be therewith content." Would it not be better to translate, "Having food and *covering*, let us be therewith content?" It is possible that St. Paul had only raiment in his eye; and σκέπασμα is sometimes used in this more limited sense (Plato, *Polit.*, 279, *d*); but seeing that it may very well include, and

does very often include, habitation,* this more general word, which it would have been still free for those who liked to understand as "raiment" alone, appears to me preferable. The Vulgate, which translates "Habentes alimenta et *quibus tegamur*," and De Wette, "Bedeckung," give the same extent to the word.

Heb. ii., 16.—"For verily he *took not on him the nature* of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham." It is well known what a consent of ancient interpreters there was to the fact that this verse contained an express allusion to the Incarnation, and our translators are here only true to the universal exposition of their age. But there is almost an equally universal denial on the part of modern expositors that there is here any reference to the Incarnation, but only generally to the fact that Christ is a helper of men and not of angels; Castellio being, I believe, the first who asserted that grammatically the other interpretation would not stand; and already we find in South a very clear statement of what may be said, and said justly, against the traditional exposition, though he himself, as it presently appears, is not prepared to let it go. I will quote the objections as he puts them, and will accept them rather than the refutation of them which he afterward supplies. "As for the words that I have here pitched upon, it must be confessed that the translation represents them very different from what they are in the original, which runs thus: Οὐ γὰρ δήπου ἐπιλαμβάνεται τοὺς ἀγγέλους—where we find that what we render by the preter tense 'He took,' the original has by the present, 'He takes;' and what we render 'the nature of angels,' the original has only τοὺς ἀγγέλους, 'angelos.' Neither is it clear that 'to take on him' or 'to assume' is the genuine signification of ἐπιλαμβάνεται. This text is generally used by divines, ancient and modern, to prove Christ's Incarnation, or assuming of the human nature, notwithstanding that this word ἐπιλαμβάνεται (as Camero well observes) is nowhere else in Scripture taken

* Σκέπης διττὸν εἶδος, τὸ μὲν ἐσθής, τὸ δὲ οἰκία. Philo, *De Vit. Con.*, § 4.

in this sense. St. Paul uses it in 1 Tim. vi., 19, but with him there it signifies 'to apprehend,' 'to attain,' or compass a thing. But its chief signification, and which seems most suitable to this place, is 'to rescue and deliver,' it being taken from the usual manner of rescuing a thing, namely, by catching hold of it, and so forcibly wringing it from the adversary; as David, when he rescued the lamb from the bear and the lion's mouth, might be properly said ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι. And Grotius observes that the proper sense of this word is 'vindicare seu asserere in libertatem manu injectâ.'"*

James iii., 5.—"Behold how great *a matter* a little fire kindleth!" This may be right. Our translators have the high authority of St. Jerome on their side, who renders (*in Esai.*, 66): "Parvus ignis quam grandem succendit *materiam;*" and compare Ecclus. xxviii., 10; yet certainly it is much more in the spirit and temper of this grand imaginative passage to take ὕλην here as "wood" or "forest:" "Behold how great *a forest* a little spark kindleth!" So the Vulgate long ago: "Ecce quantus ignis quam magnam *silvam* incendit!" and De Wette: "Siehe, ein kleines Feuer, welch einen grossen *Wald* zündet es an!" It need hardly be observed how frequently in ancient classical poetry the image of the little spark setting the great forest in a blaze recurs—in Homer, *Il.*, xi., 155; in Pindar, *Pyth.*, iii., 66, and elsewhere; nor yet how much better this of the wrapping of some vast forest in a flame by the falling of a single spark sets out that which was in St. James's mind, namely, of a far-spreading mischief springing from a smallest cause, than does the vague sense which in our version is attached to the word. Our translators have placed "wood" in the margin.

Rev. iii., 2.—"Strengthen *the things which remain*, that are ready to die." The better commentators are now agreed that τὰ λοιπά, thus rendered "*the things* which remain," should be taken rather as =τοὺς λοιποὺς, and that the angel of the Sardian Church is not bidden, as we generally understand it, to

* *Sermons*, vol. iii., p. 272.

strengthen the graces that remain in his own heart, but the few and feeble believers that remain in the Church over which he presides; the allusion being probably to Ezek. xxxiv., 2. Vitringa: "Commendat vigilantiam, quâ sibi a morte caverent, et alios ab interitu imminente vindicarent." The use of the neuter, singular and plural, where not things, but persons are intended, is too frequent in the New Testament to cause any difficulty (Winer, *Gramm.*, § 27, 4), and may have a very deep significance here, where it designates an inert and well-nigh lifeless mass.

## CHAPTER X.

### ON SOME INCORRECT RENDERINGS OF WORDS AND PASSAGES.

Our translators occasionally fail in part or altogether to give the true force of a word or a passage. In some cases it is evident they have assumed a wrong etymology. These are examples:

Matt. viii., 20.—"The birds of the air have *nests*." It stood thus in the versions preceding; the Vulgate, in like manner, has "nidos;" but some of the earlier Latin versions, "diversoria;" and Augustine, using one of these, has "tabernacula;"* and these, with their equivalent English, are on all accounts the preferable renderings. For, in the first place, birds do *not* retire to their "nests" except at one brief period of the year; and then, secondly, κατασκηνώσεις will not bear that meaning, or, at all events, has so much more naturally the more general meaning of shelters, habitations ("latibula," "cubilia;" "Wohnungen," De Wette), that one must needs agree with Grotius, who here remarks: "Quin vox hæc ad arborum ramos pertineat, dubitaturum non puto qui loca infra, xiii., 32; Marc. iv., 32, et Luc. xiii., 19, inspexerit."† He might have added to these, Psa. civ., 12; Dan. iv., 18, LXX.

Matt. x., 4; comp. Mark iii., 18.—"Simon *the Canaanite*." I have often asked myself in perplexity what our translators meant by this "Canaanite," which they are the first to use, although Cranmer's "Simon *of Canaan*," and probably Tyndale's "Simon *of Canan*," come to the same thing. Take "Canaanite" in its obvious sense, and in that which every where else in the Scripture it possesses (Gen. xii., 6; Exod. xxiii., 28; Zech. xiv., 21; and continually), and the word

* *Quæst. xvii. in Matt.*, qu. 5.

† See an excellent note in Fischer, *De Vitiis Lex. N. T.*, p. 285.

would imply that one of the twelve, of those that should sit on the twelve thrones judging the tribes of Israel, was himself not of the seed of Abraham, but of that accursed stock, which the children of Israel, going back from God's commandment, had failed utterly to extirpate on their entrance into the Promised Land, and which, having thus been permitted to live, had gradually been absorbed into the nation. This, of course, could not be; to say nothing of the word which they had before them being Κανανίτης, and not Χαναναῖος, as would have been necessary to justify the rendering of the Authorized Version. There can be no doubt that Κανανίτης here is = ζηλωτής, Luke vi., 15; Acts i., 13, and expresses the fact that Simon had been, before he joined himself to the Lord, one of those stormy zealots who, professing to follow the example of Phinehas (Num. xxv., 11), took the vindication of God's outraged law into their own hands. There is, indeed, another explanation sometimes given of the word, but the manner in which our translators have spelt the word will hardly allow one to suppose that they adopted this, and by "Canaanite" meant "of Cana," the village in Galilee. This is Jerome's view, and I suppose Beza's ("Cananites") and De Wette's ("der Kananit"); yet Κανά would surely yield, not Κανανίτης, but Κανίτης, as Ἀβδηρα, Ἀβδηρίτης. I confess myself wholly at a loss to understand the intention of our translators; for the reading Καναναῖος, which Tischendorf and Lachmann have introduced into their text, hardly known when they wrote, could certainly have exercised no influence upon them, except, indeed, through the "Chananæus" of the Vulgate.

Matt. xiv., 8.—"And she, *being before instructed* of her mother, said, Give me here John Baptist's head in a charger." A meaning is given here to προβιβασθεῖσα which it will not bear, but to which the "præmonita" of the Vulgate may have led the way. Προβιβάζειν is to urge on, or push forward, to make to advance, or sometimes, intransitively, to advance; the πρό not being of time, but of place; thus προβι-

βάζειν τὴν πατρίδα, to set forward the might of one's country (Polybius ix., 10, 4); and it is sometimes used literally, sometimes figuratively. On the one other occasion when it occurs in the New Testament it is used literally; προεβίβασαν Ἀλέξανδρον (Acts xix., 33), "they *pushed forward* Alexander," not, as in our version, "they *drew out* Alexander;" here figuratively and morally. We may conceive the unhappy girl, with all her vanity and levity, yet shrinking from the petition of blood which her mother would put into her lips, and needing to be urged on, or pushed forward, before she could be induced to make it; and this is implied in the word. I should translate, "And she, *being urged on* by her mother."

Matt. xiv., 13.—"They followed him *on foot* out of the cities." Πεζῇ might very well mean "on foot," yet it does not mean so here, but rather "by land." There could be no question that the multitude who followed Jesus would in the main proceed "on foot," and not in chariots or on horses, and it is not this which the evangelist desires to state. The contrast which he would draw is between the Lord who reached the desert place *by ship* (see the earlier part of the verse), and the multitude who found their way thither *by land.* Compare the use of πεζεύειν at Acts xx., 13, by the Rheims rightly translated "to journey by land," but in our translation, not with the same precision, "to go afoot."

Matt. xxiii., 24.—"Which strain *at* a gnat, and swallow a camel." This has often been found fault with. Long ago Bishop Lowth complained, "The impropriety of the preposition has wholly destroyed the meaning of the phrase." Yet it may well be a question here whether the inaccuracy complained of lies at the door of the translators or the printers. For myself, I feel strongly convinced that we have here a misprint, which having been passed over in the first edition of 1611, has held its ground ever since; and that our translators intended, "which strain *out* a gnat, and swallow a camel;" this being at once intelligible, and a correct rendering of the original, while our version, as at present it stands,

is neither, or only intelligible on the supposition, no doubt the supposition of most English readers, that "strain *at*" means swallow with difficulty, men hardly and with effort swallowing the little insect, but gulping down meanwhile, unconcerned, the huge animal. It need scarcely be said that this is very far from the meaning of the original words, *οἱ διυλίζοντες τὸν κώνωπα*, by Meyer rendered well "percolanda removentes muscam," and by the Vulgate also not ill, "excolantes culicem;" for which use of *διυλίζειν*, as to cleanse by passing through a strainer, see Plutarch, *Symp.*, vi., 7, 1. It was the custom of the more accurate and stricter Jews to strain their wine, vinegar, and other potables through linen or gauze, lest unawares they should drink down some little unclean insect therein, and thus transgress Lev. xi., 20, 23, 41, 42, just as the Buddhists do now in Ceylon and Hindostan—and to this custom of theirs the Lord refers. A recent traveler in North Africa writes in an unpublished communication which he has been good enough to make to me, "In a ride from Tangier to Tetuan I observed that a Moorish soldier who accompanied me, when he drank, always unfolded the end of his turban and placed it over the mouth of his *bota*, drinking through the muslin, to strain *out* the *gnats*, whose larvæ swarm in the water of that country." The further fact that our present version rests to so great an extent on the three preceding, Tyndale's, Cranmer's, and the Geneva, and that all these have "strain *out*," is additional evidence in confirmation of that about which for myself I feel no doubt, namely, that we have here an unnoticed, and thus uncorrected, error of the press; which yet, having been once allowed to pass, yielded, or seemed to yield, some sort of sense, and thus did not provoke and challenge correction, as one making sheer nonsense would have done. There was no such faultless accuracy in the first edition as should make us slow to admit this; on the contrary, more than one mistake, which had in the exemplar edition of 1611 been passed over, was subsequently discovered and removed. Thus it stood there,

at 1 Cor. iv., 9, "God hath set forth us the apostles last, as it were *approved* to death;" yet "approved" was afterward changed for the word no doubt intended, "appointed." In another passage, I mean 1 Cor. xii., 28, the misprint "helps *in* governments," after having retained its place in several successive editions, was afterward in like manner removed, and the present correcter reading, "helps, governments" (*ἀντιλήψεις, γυβερνήσεις*), substituted in its room.

Mark xi., 4.—"*A place where two ways met.*" Ἄμφοδος (*ἀμφί* and *ὁδός*) is rather a way round, a crooked lane.

Mark xii., 26.—"Have ye not read in the book of Moses how *in the bush* God spake unto him?" But *ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου*, as all acknowledge now, is not "in the bush," as indicating the place from which God spake to Moses, but means "in that portion of Scripture which goes by the name of The Bush"—the Jews being wont to designate different portions of Scripture by the most memorable thing or fact recorded in them; thus one portion was called *ἡ βάτος*. How, indeed to tell this story in the English Version is not easy to determine, without forsaking the translator's sphere and entering into that of the commentator. I may observe that *ἐν Ἠλίᾳ* (Rom. xi., 2) is a quotation of the same kind. It can never mean "of Elias," as in our translation, but is rather "in the history of Elias," in that section of Scripture which tells of him; so De Wette: "in der Geschichte des Elia."

Acts xiv., 15.—"We also are *men of like passions* with you." This fact would not have disproved in the eyes of these Lycaonians the right of Paul and Silas to be considered gods. The heathen were only too ready to ascribe to their gods like passions, revenge, lust, envy, with their own. Ὁμοιοπαθεῖς ὑμῖν means rather "subject to like conditions," that is, of pain, sickness, old age, death, "with yourselves." Translate, "We also are *men who suffer like things* with yourselves." The Vulgate, "Et nos *mortales* sumus," is on the right track; and Tyndale, "We are *mortal men* like unto you." The only other passage in the New Testament in

which ὁμοιοπαθής occurs (James v., 17) will need to be slightly modified in the same sense.

Acts xvii., 22.—"I perceive that in all things ye are *too superstitious.*" This, as Luther's "allzu abergläubisch," is a rendering very much to be regretted. Whatever severe things St. Paul might be obliged to say to his hearers, yet it was not his way to begin by insulting, and in this way alienating them from himself, and from the truth of which he was the bearer. Rather, if there was any thing in them which he could praise, he would praise that, and only afterward condemn that which demanded condemnation. So is it here; he affirmed, and no doubt they took it for praise, that by his own observation he had gathered they were ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους, as men greatly addicted to the worship of deities, "very religious," as I should render it, giving to "religious" its true sense, and not the mischievous sense which it has now acquired. So Beza, "religiosiores;" and De Wette, "sehr gottesfürchtig." This was the praise which all antiquity gave to the Athenians, and which Paul does not withhold, using at the same time with the finest tact and skill a middle word, capable of a good sense, and capable of a bad—a word originally of honorable meaning, but which had already slipped in part into a dishonorable sense; thus finely insinuating that this service of theirs might easily slip, or have slipped already, into excess, or might be rendered to wrong objects. Still these words are to be taken, not as a holding up to them of their sin, but as a *captatio benevolentiæ*, and it must be confessed they are coarsely rendered in our version.

Acts xxv., 5.—"Let them, therefore, said he, *which* among you *are able*, go down." But *οἱ δυνατοί* is not "those which are able," but "those which are in authority," as the Vulgate rightly, "qui potentes sunt:" see Lösner, *Obss. in N. T., in loco.*

Rom. ii., 22.—"Thou that abhorrest idols, *dost thou commit sacrilege?*" This is too general, and fails to bring out with sufficient distinctness the charge which the apostle in

this ἱεροσυλεῖς is making against the Jew. The charge is this: "Thou professest to abhor idols, and yet art so mastered by thy covetousness that, if opportunity offers, thou wilt not scruple thyself to lay hands on these gold and silver abominations, and to make them thy own" (see Chrysostom, *in loco*). Read, "Thou that abhorrest idols, *dost thou rob temples?*"

Rom. xi., 8.—"According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit *of slumber*." Our translators must have derived κατάνυξις from νυστάζειν, as indeed many others have done, before they could have given it this meaning. Yet they plainly have their misgiving in respect of the correctness of this etymology, for they propose "remorse" in the margin, evidently on the correcter hypothesis that the word is not from νυστάζειν, but νύσσειν. Still, even if they had put "remorse," as the *compunction* of the soul (the Vulgate has "compunctio"), into the text, though they would have been etymologically right, they would not have seized the exact force of κατάνυξις, at least in Hellenistic Greek, as is plain from the service which it does in the Septuagint (Isa. xxix., 10; Psa. lix., 3), and from the Hebrew words which it is there made to render. This is no place for entering at length into all (and it is much) which has been written on this word. Sufficient to say that it is properly the stupor or stupefaction, the astonishment, bringing "astonishment" back to its stronger and earlier meaning, the stunnedness ("Betäubung," De Wette) consequent on a wound or blow, νύσσειν, as I need hardly observe, being "to strike" as well as "to pierce." "Torpor," only that this so easily suggests the wrong etymology, and runs into the notion of deep sleep, would not be a bad rendering of it. "Stupor," which the "Five Clergymen" have adopted, is perhaps better. Hammond, whose marginal emendations of the Authorized Version are often exceedingly valuable, and deserve more attention than they have received, being about the most valuable part of his *Paraphrase and Annotations upon the New Testament*, has sug-

gested "senselessness;" but this is not one of his happiest emendations.

Gal. i., 18.—"I went up to Jerusalem *to see* Peter." Ἱστορεῖν is not merely "to see," but properly to inquire, to investigate, to interrogate, to arrive by personal knowledge, ocular or other, at the actual knowledge of past events; and then, secondarily, to set down the results of these investigations, just as ἱστορία is first this investigation, and then, in a secondary sense, the result of it duly set down, or, as we say, "history." Here, indeed, it is a person, and not things, which are the object of this closer knowledge. "I went up to Jerusalem," says Paul, "*to acquaint myself with* Peter" ("accuratius cognoscere; itaque plus inest quam in verbo ἰδεῖν." —Winer).

Gal. v., 19, 20.—"The works of the flesh are manifest, . . . *seditions*." It is at first perplexing to find this as the rendering of διχοστασίαι, which is evidently a word of wider reach; but Archdeacon Hare has admirably accounted for its appearance in this place.* I will quote his words: "When our version is inaccurate or inadequate, this does not arise, as it does throughout in the Rhemish Version, from a coincidence with the Vulgate, yet its inadequate renderings often seem to have arisen from an imperfect apprehension of some Latin substitute for the word in the Greek text—from taking some peculiar sense of the Latin word different from that in which it was used to represent the Greek original. Let me illustrate this by a single instance. Among the works of the flesh St. Paul (Gal. v., 20) numbers διχοστασίαι, which we render 'seditions.' But 'seditions' in our old, as well as our modern language, are only one form of the divisions implied by διχοστασίαι, and assuredly not the form which would present itself foremost to the apostle's mind when writing to the Galatians. At first, too, one is puzzled to understand how the word 'seditions' came to suggest itself in the place, instead of the more general term 'divisions,' which is the

* *Mission of the Comforter*, p. 391.

plain correspondent to διχοστασίαι, and is so used in Rom. xvi., 17, and in 1 Cor. iii., 3. Here the thought occurs that the Latin word 'seditio,' though in its ordinary acceptation equivalent to its English derivative, yet primarily and etymologically answers very closely to διχοστασίαι; and one is naturally led to conjecture that our translators must have followed some Latin version, in which the word 'seditiones' was used, not without an affectation of archaic elegance. Now the Vulgate has "dissensiones,' but in Erasmus, whose style was marked by that characteristic, we find the very word 'seditiones.' Hence Tyndale, whom we know from his controversial writings to have made use of Erasmus's version, took his 'sedition,' not minding that the sense in which Erasmus had used the Latin word was alien to the English; and from Tyndale it has come down, with a mere change of number, into our present version, while Wicliffe and the Rhemish render the Vulgate by 'dissensions.'"

Ephes. iv., 29.—"Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good *to the use of edifying.*" But to justify these last words, to which Beza's "ad ædificationis usum" may have led the way, we should have found, not πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς χρείας, but πρὸς or εἰς χρείαν τῆς οἰκοδομῆς. No one will affirm that we have such an hypallage here. There is much more in the words than such a translation, even were it allowable, would educe from them. It is not very easy to give, without circumlocution, a satisfactory English rendering; but the meaning is abundantly clear. "Let such discourse," St. Paul would say, "proceed from your mouths as is profitable to the present emergent need or occasion; do not deal in vague, flat, unmeaning generalities, which would suit a thousand other cases equally well, and probably, therefore, equally ill; let your words be what the words of wise men will always be, nails fastened in a sure place, words suiting the present time and the present person, being *for the edifying of the occasion.*" "Edification of the need," Ellicott has it; and De Wette, "zur Erbauung nach

Bedürfniss." An admonition of a similar character is couched in the εἰδέναι πῶς δεῖ ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ ἀποκρίνεσθαι of the parallel passage in the Colossians (iv., 6). Not so much "*every* man," as our version has it, but "*each* one" (εἷς ἕκαστος) must have his own answer, that which meets *his* difficulties, *his* perplexities. There must not be *one* unfeeling, unsympathizing, unvarying answer for all.

Phil. iv., 3.—"And I entreat thee also, true yokefellow, help *those* women which labored with me in the Gospel, with Clement also." The alteration which this passage requires is exceedingly slight. Let only "those" be changed into "these," and a comma be placed after "women," and then the close connection of this verse with the verse preceding, most necessary for its right understanding, will plainly appear, and otherwise it will render up its sense clearly, which now it can hardly be affirmed to do. St. Paul has in that verse besought two faithful women in the Philippian Church, very probably deaconesses, Euodias* and Syntyche, between whom some difference had arisen, to lay this aside, and to be again "of the same mind in the Lord." He now turns to one who, from some cause or other, was eminently fitted to be a peacemaker between these two, and addressing him as "true yokefellow," as one made to be a knitter again of the loosened bonds or yokes of love, exhorts him to "help *these* women," that is, to help them in a coming together again—that he should remove all obstacles and hinderances to this; and the apostle finds a motive to this exhortation, a reason why this "true yokefellow" should be at pains herein, namely, *because* these two (observe αἵτινες="quippe quæ") had labored with himself and others in the Gospel, and had both of them well deserved by these labors of love that they should not be left with any discord or dissension between

* I should prefer "Euodia," as it is in the Geneva Version, which would mark more clearly that it is a woman's name. Hammond, missing the fact that we have here to do with women at all, would change, on the contrary, "Syntyche" into "Syntyches."

them, if Christian help could remove this. Let this third verse be read with these slight alterations here proposed, and its meaning is sufficiently clear.

Col. i., 15.—"Who is the image of the invisible God, *the first-born of every creature.*" This is one of the very few renderings in our version which obscures a great doctrinal truth, and, indeed, worse than this, seems to play into the hands of Arian error. For does it not legitimately follow on this "first-born of every creature," or "of all creation," that he of whom this is predicated must be himself also a creature, although the first in the creation of God? But in the phrase πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, we are not to regard πάσης κτίσεως as a partitive genitive, so that Christ is included in the "every creature," though distinguished as being the first-born among them, but rather as a genitive of comparison, depending on, and governed by, the πρῶτος (see John i., 15, 30) which lies in πρωτότοκος. I am not quite satisfied with "born before every creature," or "brought forth before every creature," because there lies in the original words a comparison between the begetting of the Son and the creation of the creature, and not merely an opposition; He is placed at the head of a series, though essentially differing from all that followed in the fact that he was born and they only created; the great distinction between the γεννᾶν (or τίκτειν, as it is here) and the κτίζειν, which came so prominently forward in the Arian controversy, being here already marked. Still, I could have no question as between it and the "first-born of every creature" of our version, which obviously suggests an erroneous meaning, though it may be just capable of receiving a right one. It was nothing strange that Waterland, who, in the beginning of the last century, fought the great battle of the English Church against the Arianism which claimed a right to exist in her very bosom, should have been very ill-content to find a most important testimony to that truth for which he was contending foregone and renounced, so far, at least, as the English translation reached. Nor was this all; the verse

was not merely taken away from him, but, in appearance at least, made over to his adversaries. He often complains of this, as in the following passage: "In respect of the words, 'first-born of every creature' comes not up to the force or meaning of the original. It should have been '*born* (or begotten) *before the whole creation*,' as is manifest from the context, which gives the reason why he is said to be πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως. It is because he is 'before all things,' and because by him were all things created. So that this very passage, which, as it stands in our translation, may seem to suppose the Son one of the creatures, does, when rightly understood, clearly exempt him from the number of creatures. He was before all created being, and consequently was himself *uncreated*, existing with the Father from all eternity."*

1 Tim. iv., 1, 2, 3.—"In the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry." It is difficult to say exactly how our translators intended here to deal with our original. There is one very obvious meaning to give to their version, that which almost every English reader does give, but one which involves a greater, and yet more obvious error than one is disposed to lay at their door. Mede, however, in a passage which I quote, but abridge in quoting, does not shrink from ascribing this to them. Yet I quote him here, not so much for his criticism of what they have done, or what he supposes them to have done, as because he himself deals with the passage in the only right way. Speaking of our version, he says, "The syntax of the words in the Greek is incapable of such a construction; for the persons intimated in the former verse are expressed *in casu recto*, as τινὲς προσέχοντες, but the persons intended here (ver. 2) we find in the genitive, ψευδολόγων κ.τ.λ., which can not agree with τινές and προσέχοντες.† They would indeed

* *Serm.* 2, *Christ's Divinity proved from Creation.*

† Another inconvenience he does not mention, that the seduced and the seducers in the Church would thus be confounded.

agree with δαιμονίων, but that would be a harsh sense every way; for either we must say, as some do, that by 'devils' are meant devilish men, which is a hard signification, or else it would be a stranger sense to say that devils should lie, have seared consciences, or forbid marriage or meats; so that Beza and others had rather confess a breach of syntax than incur the inconvenience of such a forced sense. But what needs this, so long as there is a better way to solve it? namely, to make all these genitives to be governed of ἐν ὑποκρίσει. I see no way but this to keep the syntax true and even, and wholly to avoid the forementioned inconveniences. As for the use of the preposition ἐν, to signify *causam*, *instrumentum*, or *modum actionis*, he that is not a stranger to the Scripture knows it to be most frequent, the Greek text borrowing it from the use of the Hebrew preposition ב; comp. Matt. v., 13; Acts xvii., 31; Tit. i., 9; 2 Pet. iii., 1; 2 Thess. ii., 9, 10; so in my text, ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων κ.τ.λ., this was the manner, means, and quality of the persons whereby the doctrine of demons was first brought in, advanced, and maintained in the Church, namely, through the hypocrisy of those who told lies, of those who had their consciences seared, etc."*

Heb. xi., 29.—"Which the Egyptians essaying to do, *were drowned*." Did our translators prefer the reading κατεποντίσθησαν? This is not very probable, the authority for it being so small. If they did not, and if they read, as is most likely, κατεπόθησαν, they should have rendered it by some word of wider reach, as, for instance, "were swallowed up," or "were ingulfed" ("devorati sunt," Vulgate; "verschlungen wurden," Bleek). "Swallowed up," besides being nearer the original, would more accurately set forth the historic fact. The pursuing armies of the Egyptians sunk in the sands quite as much as they were overwhelmed by the waves of the Red Sea, as is expressly declared in the hymn of triumph which Moses composed on the occasion; κατέπιεν αὐτοὺς γῆ, Exod. xv., 12; comp. Diodorus Siculus, i., 32, ὑπ' ἄμμον καταπίνεται.

* *Apostasy of the Latter Times*, part ii., c. 1.

James i., 26.—"If any man among you *seem to be* religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain." This verse, as it here stands, can not but have perplexed many. How, it has been asked, can a man "*seem to be* religious," that is, present himself to others as such, when his religious pretensions are belied and refuted by the allowance of an unbridled tongue? But the perplexity has been introduced by our translators, who have here failed to play the part of accurate synonymists, and to draw the line sharply and distinctly between the verbs δοκεῖν and φαίνεσθαι. Δοκεῖν expresses the subjective mental opinion of any thing which men form, their δόξα about it, which may be right (Acts xv., 28; 1 Cor. iv., 9) or which may be wrong (Matt. vi., 7; Mark vi., 49; Acts xxvii., 13); φαίνεσθαι the objective external appearance which it presents, quite independent of men's conception about it. Thus, when Xenophon writes ἐφαίνετο ἴχνια ἵππων (*Anab.*, i., 6, 1), he would affirm that horses had been actually there, and left their tracks. Had he employed the alternative word, it would have implied that Cyrus and his company took for tracks of horses what might have been, or what also very possibly might not have been, such at all. "Δοκεῖν cernitur in opinione, quæ falsa esse potest et vana. Sed φαίνεσθαι plerumque est in re extra mentem; quamvis nemo opinatur."* Apply this distinction to the passage before us; keep in mind that δοκεῖν, and not φαίνεσθαι, is the word used, and all is plain: "If any man among you *think himself* religious ("se putat religiosum esse," Vulgate), and bridleth not his tongue, etc." It is his own subjective estimate of his spiritual condition which is here expressed, an estimate which the following words declare to be entirely erroneous. Let me observe here that the same rendering of δοκεῖν, Gal. ii., 6, 9, lends a color to St. Paul's words which is very far from being justly theirs. As we read in English, we seem to detect a certain covert irony upon his part in regard of the pretensions of the three great apostles

* Vömel, *Synonymische Wörterbuch*, p. 207.

whom he met at Jerusalem ("who *seemed to be* something" —"who *seemed to be* pillars"). There is, in fact, nothing of the kind: he expresses, not what they *seemed* or appeared, but what they by others were, and were rightly, *held to be*. The Geneva having "which are in estimation"—"which are taken to be pillars"—is here, as so often, correct; correct also, it will be observed, in making δοκοῦντες in both these verses a present, and not an imperfect participle.

1 Pet. iii., 16.—"Having a good conscience, that *whereas* they speak evil of you as of evil doers, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ." For "whereas" (ἐν ᾧ) substitute "wherein." The correction is not trivial, but brings out the exact point of St. Peter's admonition, which we now miss. It is this: Not the doctrine, but the moral walk and conversation of the Christians, was the special object against which the calumnies of the heathen were directed,* as, for instance, all manner of hideous reports were afloat in regard of what they did in their secret assemblies. Now, says the apostle, in that very matter *in which* (ἐν ᾧ) they calumniate you the most, put them in that most manifestly to an open and wholesome shame, even in your walk, by the blameless innocency and purity of your conversation in the world: "ut *in eo* quod detrahunt vobis confundantur" (Vulg.). At chap. ii., 12, precisely the same emendation will need to be made. There indeed "wherein" is suggested in the margin.

Jude 12.—"Trees *whose fruit withereth*." But φθινοπωρινός has here a meaning ascribed to it which it nowhere possesses, as though it were =ὠλεσίκαρπος, the φθινόκαρπος of Pindar, *Pyth.*, iv., 265, or the "frugiperdus" of Pliny. The φθινόπωρον is the late autumn, the autumn far spent, which succeeds the ὀπώρα, or the autumn contemplated as the time of the ripened fruits of the earth, and which has its name παρὰ τὸ φθίνεσθαι τὴν ὀπώραν, from the waning away of the autumn and the autumn fruits, themselves also often called the ὀπώρα;

* "Quos *per flagitia* invisos vulgus Christianos vocabat."—*Tacitus.*

and φθινοπωρινός is always used in the sense of belonging to the late autumn. The Latin language has no word which distinguishes the later autumn from the earlier, and therefore the "arbores *autumnales*" of the Vulgate is a correct translation, and one as accurate as the language would allow, unless, indeed, it had been rendered "arbores *senescentis autumni*," or by some such phrase as De Wette, in his German translation, has it, "*spät*herbstliche." We, I think, could scarcely get beyond "*autumnal* trees," or "trees *of autumn*," as the Rheims Version gives it. These deceivers are likened by the apostle to trees as they show in late autumn, when foliage and fruit alike are gone. Bengel: "Arbor tali specie qualis est autumno extremo, sine foliis et pomis." The φθινοπωρινά, ἄκαρπα, will then, in fact, mutually complete one another: "without leaves, without fruit." Tyndale, who throws together δένδρα φθινοπωρινὰ ἄκαρπα, and renders the whole phrase thus, "trees without fruit *at gathering time*," was feeling after, though he has not grasped, the right translation.

## CHAPTER XI.

### ON SOME CHARGES UNJUSTLY BROUGHT AGAINST THE AUTHORIZED VERSION.

THERE are certain charges which have been brought, and some of them are still repeated, against our translation, of the injustice of which I feel deeply convinced. I do not now allude to charges which have been already noticed, and which testify to a want of familiarity on the part of those who make them with the changes which the English language, since the time when our version was published, has undergone. Those on which I now would say something are of quite a different kind. They move in quite a different sphere, are of a far more serious character, and, indeed, touch so nearly the honor and good faith of the authors of our version, that they can hardly be passed over without observation. Our translators, then, are accused, as is familiar to many, of a deceitful handling of the Word of God, of snatching at unfair advantages, gratifying their own leanings in regard both of doctrine and discipline, at the expense of that strict, impartial accuracy which it is the prime duty of those holding their position of trust and confidence always to maintain, of slurring over passages of Scripture which seem to make for an adversary, or compelling others to bear a testimony in their own favor which, except on this undue compulsion, they would never have borne.

These charges may, for clearness and convenience sake, be divided under the following heads, which will include, if not all, yet all the more important accusations of this kind which have at any time been made.

1. Charges made by Roman Catholics that our translators have compelled passages of Scripture to tell against Roman

doctrine, which, fairly translated, would yield no such testimony against it; while they have weakened or destroyed the witness of other passages, which, were the version a more honest one, would be found on the side of Rome, in the points at issue between her and the Reformed Church.

2. Charges, made chiefly in times past, by Protestant Dissenters in respect of such words as bear upon the points of Church government and discipline debated between them and us, such, for instance, as "bishop," "church," "ordain" —that we have not played true in respect of these, but have every where given a more ecclesiastical tone and coloring to the translation than, fairly and impartially rendered, it would have borne.

3. Charges made by Arminians, either within or without the Church, accusing our translators of Calvinistic tendencies, out of which they have brought passages to bear on this controversy, and in their own sense, that have no proper reference to it at all—have given, so to speak, an edge to some statements, and blunted the edge of others, according as these seemed to make for or against the scheme of doctrine which they favored.

4. Charges made in modern times by Arians and Socinians, who affirm that our version has put an undue emphasis on various passages bearing on the nature and dignity of the Son of God, had set him forth in a manner which the original would not warrant as God in the very highest sense of the word. To this is in general appended a further complaint, but one closely connected with the preceding, to the effect that sacrificial terms, as "propitiation," "atonement," and the like, have been needlessly and unwarrantably brought in.

It will at once be seen that it would be totally impossible to enter into all the controversies which in these objections are stirred. Any exhaustive dealing with them would lead very far away from the main purpose of this book, while it would be much easier to open than to close the discussions in which it would thus become necessary to engage. De-

clining to plunge into these, all that I can pretend to do is to take one or two salient points under each of these heads —one or two of the imputations of unfairness most often made—to deal with these; and, if they are capable of being satisfactorily set aside, to argue from this that it is at least probable that the others might be as successfully dealt with.

And, first, in regard of the complaints made by the Roman Catholics. The most elaborate attack upon the Anglican Version from this quarter is contained in a work by Gregory Martin, a seminary priest, published in 1582* — published, therefore, some thirty years *before* our present translation. It will naturally follow from this date that some of its charges are, as regards our version, beside the mark, and do not touch it. So very much, however, of the earlier translations survives in our final revision, that in a vast number of instances they bear with the same force, or weakness, upon the version as it stands now as they did upon its predecessors.

Let me here first observe, that it is very unreasonable to find fault with our translators, that, in certain passages fairly capable of two renderings, one of which gave a stronger testimony in favor of what they believed to be the truth, or in condemnation of what they believed to be error, than the other, they should have adopted that which fell in with all their antecedent convictions; for instance, that at Heb. xiii., 4, they should incline to that interpretation, and adopt that rendering, which justified the abolition in the Reformed Church of the compulsory celibate of the clergy. The rendering of

* The long title of the book is as follows: *A discovery of the manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by the Heretics of our Day, especially by the English Sectaries, and of their foul dealing herein by partial and false Translations, to the advantage of their Heresies, in their English Bibles used and authorized since the Time of Schism.* Rheims, 1582. Fulke's *Defence of the Sincere and True Translation of the Holy Scriptures into the English Tongue*, published in London the year following, contains a sufficient reply to most of his cavils; in respect of sincerity, I think, to all. The most important work in later times is Ward's *Errata of the Protestant Bible*, Dublin, 1810. In addition to these, there are many hostile criticisms upon our version scattered over various polemical works.

ἐν πᾶσι, "in all," *i. e.*, "inter omnes" (a masculine and not a neuter), was open to them; it was the interpretation adopted by many of the ancient fathers; grammatically it can be perfectly justified; it is accepted to the present day by many who are not in the least drawn to it by doctrinal, but purely by philological interests, and it is certainly very idle to complain of them that they preferred it.

Setting, then, such passages aside, I will adduce one or two others of a different character. The first is one where this charge has been sometimes allowed by writers of our own communion. Thus Professor Stanley is inclined to ascribe to "theological fear or partiality" that, in St. Paul's statement, "Whosoever shall eat this bread, *or* drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" (1 Cor. xi., 27), they have substituted "and" for "or." I have no suspicion that they did this "in order to avoid the inference that the Eucharist might be received under one kind." In the first place, there is authority for "and;" hardly, to my mind, sufficient authority, but so much that an eminent scholar like Fritzche, with no theological leaning on one side or the other, even now prefers it, and Lachmann has given it a place in his text. Moreover, such an inference from these words is so extravagantly absurd, so refuted by several other statements in this very chapter, that I can not see how they should have cared to exclude it. Even had they been willing to sacrifice truth and honesty, they were under no temptation to do so. They probably accepted καί as the right reading.

Gal. v., 6.—"Faith *which worketh* by love." It was for a long time a favorite charge of the Romanists, even in the face of their own Vulgate, which has rightly "fides quæ per caritatem *operatur*," in the face, too, of the invariable use of ἐνεργεῖσθαι as a middle verb in the New Testament (Rom. vii., 5; 2 Cor. i., 6; iv., 12; Ephes. iii., 20; James v., 16), that we had given to ἐνεργουμένη an active sense when it ought to have a passive; and that we had done this, dreading lest

there should be found here any support for their doctrine of the "fides formata," as the faith which justifies. They would have had the words translated "faith which *is wrought on*," *i.e.*, animated, stirred up, "by love." Other unfriendly critics have repeated the charge. There is no need, however, to refute it, as the later Roman Catholic expositors, Windischmann, for instance,* have acknowledged the accuracy of our translation, have accepted it as the only true one, and thus implicitly allowed the injustice of this charge.

Indeed, it is not too much to say that if, in the heat of earlier controversy, any shadow of unfair advantage might seem to have been taken by the first Protestant translators after the Reformation, those of King James's Bible were careful to forego and renounce every thing of the kind. Thus it was a complaint, and I can not esteem it an unreasonable one, on the part of Roman Catholic assailants of our earlier versions,† that they rendered εἴδωλον "image," and not "idol;" and εἰδωλολάτρης "worshiper of *images*," and not "worshiper of *idols*" or "idolater;" in this way confounding the honor paid in the Roman Church to images with the idol-worship of heathenism. They urged that, however we might reprobate and condemn the former, it was confessedly an entirely different thing from the latter; while yet our translators went out of their way, and departed from the more natural rendering of εἴδωλον, for the purpose of including both under a common reproach; that, indeed, by such renderings as this, "How agreeth the temple of God with *images?*" (2 Cor. vi., 16), they suggested and helped forward the destruction of these in all the churches through the land. The complaint was a just one, and our last translators seem to have so regarded it. They have nowhere employed the offensive term, but always used "idolater" and "idol." Thus, compare 1 Cor. x., 7; 1 John v., 21, in our version, with the same in

* *Erklärung des Briefes an die Galater*, Mainz, 1843, p. 131.

† See Ward's *Errata of the Protestant Bible*, p. 63; compare Fulke's *Defence of the English Translation*, ch. iii., § 1.

the earlier Anglican versions; in the latter passage, indeed, the Geneva had anticipated this correction.

In respect of objections sometimes made by Dissenters against our translation, it would be to little profit to make this an occasion of entering on the long controversies between the English Church, which has recognized Episcopal government as of divine intention and institution, and those bodies which deny this. In the main, those bodies, in consenting, with no outward constraint upon them, to use the Authorized Version, have admitted that in this matter no very grievous wrong is done to them; nor, it must be owned, are there any loud complaints or charges of unfairness upon this score made at the present day. Still, such do from time to time make themselves heard. I shall content myself with observing that, if not in all, yet in nearly all, those passages which are most objected to, we have merely followed versions preceding, and those not exclusively the Bishops' Bible or Cranmer's, but Tyndale's and the Geneva—neither of them with any very strong sympathy for our Church government. For instance, it was the Geneva which had the credit of restoring "Church" instead of "congregation" as the rendering of ἐκκλησία. Then, too, it has been often said, and the charge is by no means obsolete, that the translation of ἐπισκόπους by "overseers" at Acts xx., 28, and not by "bishops," as elsewhere, is a flagrant piece of dishonesty, committed in the hope of in this manner obscuring the fact that there were many "bishops" in the single Church of Ephesus, *ergo* that "bishop"="presbyter." But so clear is it that ἐπίσκοπος is here not the technical name of an office, but the expression of the fact of oversight, that Tyndale, Cranmer, Coverdale, the Geneva, had all so rendered it before. Again, what "party zeal" was at work when ἐπισκοπή was rendered "bishopric" (Acts i., 20), or what we could hope to gain from this translation, it is difficult to see. "Charge," or some such word, would be preferable, for the same reason that ἐπίσκοπος (Acts xx., 28) is better rendered "overseer" than "bishop,"

namely, because the word is not technical and official; but in employing "bishopric" we did but retain the rendering of Wicliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, and Cranmer.

The complaint that there were Calvinistic, as against Arminian, leanings in our translators, modifying, consciously or unconsciously, the rendering of various passages, differs from all other with which in this chapter I have to deal, that it is not urged exclusively by parties external to our Church, but proceeds quite as much and as often from those within it as from those without. This charge rests mainly, though not exclusively, on the three following places, Matt. xx., 23; Acts ii., 27; Heb. x., 38. It may be worth while to speak a few words severally upon each.

Matt. xx., 23.—"To sit on my right hand and on my left is not mine to give, *but it shall be given* to them for whom it is prepared of my Father." On this rendering, to which the Geneva Version showed the way, Professor Scholefield does not scruple to say, "By foisting in the supernumerary words [it shall be given], we make the passage contain a doctrine directly contrary to other places of Scripture: *ex. gr.*, John xvii., 2; Rev. iii., 21;" and Dr. Beard: "The Calvinism of the Geneva Version stands out here in bold relief."* And, indeed, this charge of something like bad faith in our rendering of this passage reaches very far back. It occupies a foremost place in the array of charges brought against our version by Robert Gell.† "This translation," he complains,

* *Revision of the English Bible*, p. 309.

† In the *Preface*, unpaged, but p. 12–17 of his *Essay toward the Amendment of the last English Translation of the Bible*, folio; London, 1659. This work is chiefly remarkable as being the first—the first, at least, with which I am acquainted—which brings a series of accusations of deliberate mistranslation against the authors of our version. The book, a folio of more than eight hundred pages, but containing exceedingly little on the subject which it professes to treat, and that little mainly having to do with the Old Testament, is not likely to be in the hands of many readers; but those who miss it have not missed much. Gell was a really learned man, but cross-grained, ill-tempered, in his reaction against Calvinistic excesses running into dangerous extremes on the other side; and his works, if the others may be judged by this

"makes our Lord absolutely to deny that he hath any power to give the honor of sitting at his right hand and left, and so they rob the Lord Jesus of his regalia, his royalties, and those honors which he hath right and authority to bestow;" with some four pages more in the same style, aggravating the greatness of the offense which they have herein committed. Now I do not count it necessary to discuss the correctness or incorrectness of this rendering; I will only observe that such a scholar as the present Bishop of Ely, one certainly not supposed to have any Calvinistic leanings, after a full and careful consideration purely grammatical,* is disposed to leave the passage as it now stands, to supply, as our translators have done, a δοθήσεται ἐκείνοις, and to reject the proposed emendation resting on the assumption that ἀλλά is here =εἰ μή. Meyer, who has certainly no doctrinal interest to overbear his philological, speaks with still greater decision on the

sample, have their bushels of chaff with scarcely their grains of wheat. In proof, however, that he has the latter, I will quote here some objections which he makes against one passage in our version, where certainly he has right and reason on his side. I allude to Heb. x., 34: "For ye . . . took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, *knowing in yourselves* that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance." He has right so far as he affirms that this translation might be bettered, that ἑαυτοῖς, or ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, should rather be construed with ἔχειν than with γινώσκοντες. "The words," he says, "are inverted and changed from the genuine order of them, which is extant in the Greek—Γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοῖς κρείττονα ὕπαρξιν ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ μενοῦσαν, which I render thus: 'Knowing that ye have in yourselves better wealth in heaven, and that which will endure.' What a difference is here! That translation persuades men that they shall have hereafter in heaven a better kind of wealth. The true reading of these words supposes believers to have already a real possession of the better and more enduring substance in themselves, so that they take the spoiling of their outward goods with joy; . . . which order of words is wholly neglected by all the printed English translations that I have yet seen; and hereby the sense of the Holy Spirit is much obscured, which points at the present and real possession of the better and durable riches which 'Wisdom hath, and brings with her to the believing soul' (Prov. viii., 10)." All this is very good; but when Gell goes on to affirm that the mistranslation was intentional, lest it might appear from the passage, rightly translated, that there was inherent righteousness in God's saints, which is a great point with him, this is only too much of a piece with the whole tone of his book.

* *The Text of the English Bible considered*, second edition, p. 71–76.

matter: "Jesus weist hier die fragliche Bitte mit der unumwundenen Erklärung ab: die Verleihung des gebetenen gehöre zu den Reservaten Gottes: er der Messias habe diese Befugniss nicht."

Acts ii., 47.—"The Lord added to the Church daily *such as should be saved*." It is urged against our translators that in the original it is not τοὺς σωθησομένους, which would alone have justified this rendering, but τοὺς σωζομένους. Now admitting, which many scholars would refuse to do, that the Greek imperfect participle can never have the force which is given to it here; admitting, I say, this, the explanation would still be sufficiently easy of their slight departure from an accurate rendering, without ascribing to them, or those who went before them in this translation, any undue dogmatic bias. They were perplexed with a language which spoke of those as already saved who only became saved through being thus added to the Church of the living God. They probably did not clearly perceive that by this language the sacred historian meant to say that *in this act* of adherence to the Church, and to Christ its Head, these converts were saved, delivered from the wrath to come; "those that did escape," Hammond renders it. They had no wish, except to avoid a fancied difficulty, and I do not believe that the thought of predestination, least of all of predestination as involving reprobation, once entered into their minds, however others may have since employed the words as a support for the doctrine. Indeed, it is well worthy of note that the Rhemish Version gives precisely the same future meaning to τοὺς σωζομένους, and renders "they that should be saved."

Heb. x., 38.—"Now the just shall live by faith; but if *any man* draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." Bishop Pearson* brings a charge of *mala fides* against Beza, the first who rendered ἐὰν ὑποστείληται "si *quis* se subduxerit." But if bad faith in him, bad faith also in all who accepted from him this rendering of the words, and became ac-

* *Minor Theological Works*, vol. ii., p. 264.

cessories after the fact. The charge, not always in language quite so strong, reappears continually; no objection to the entire good faith of our translators is indeed oftener urged. In our own times, Professor Blunt* has not hesitated to affirm that the doctrinal tendencies of our translators exercised here an unwarrantable influence on their work. So, too, the present Bishop of Ely, who has a long and learned note upon the subject,† plainly thinks the case not a good one for any concerned in it. No unprejudiced person, it is said, can read the verse in the original, and not acknowledge that the person whose drawing back is supposed possible in the second clause of the verse is "the just" of the first clause. So Tyndale had translated it: "But the just shall live by faith; and if *he* withdraw himself," etc.; Coverdale and Cranmer in the same way. But this verse, so rendered, would have contradicted the doctrine of final perseverance; and therefore, it is said, in the Geneva Version, Beza's way of escape from this conclusion was eagerly grasped at, and "any" there substituted for "he," and "any man" in our version. Now I certainly myself think that δίκαιος *is* the nominative to ὑποστείληται, and that the passage does contradict the doctrine of final perseverance in its high Calvinistic or necessitarian shape. But to the present day, the other scheme of the verse, that, namely, of our translation, which would disengage an ἄνθρωπος or a τίς from δίκαιος, and make *it* the nominative to ὑποστείληται, is maintained by scholars such as De Wette and Winer,‡ who are certainly as remote as well can be from any Calvinistic inclinations.

There is, lastly, the charge made by Arians and Unitarians. I will content myself here with urging the fact that our translators, so far from pushing advantages against these too far, if they have erred any where, erred rather in the opposite extreme. One passage has already been dealt with, namely,

* *Duties of the Parish Priest*, p. 57.

† *The Text of the English Bible considered.* Cambridge, 1833, p. 78–86.

‡ *Gramm.*, § 49, 2.

Col. i., 15, where they have thus fallen short of the force of their original. Two others present themselves to me, in one of which certainly, in the other probably, they have done the same.

The first of these is John v., 18: "Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also *that God was his father* (πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγε τὸν Θεόν), making himself equal with God." It is strange that our translators, who have recognized in so many places the emphatic character of ἴδιος (as at Matt. xxv., 14; John i., 41; Tit. ii., 9; 1 Pet. iii., 1), in some of which it is very doubtful whether this recognition ought to have found place,* should have failed to recognize it here, where the whole context imperiously demands its recognition. Unless Christ had claimed that God was his *own* father in a special, peculiar sense not common to him and to all men, or at least to him and all the elect nation, what accusation of blasphemy could the Jews have founded upon this? for had not God challenged this name (Mal. i., 6), and prophets given it to him? or how could the words which follow, "making himself equal with God," which are evidently explanatory of the claim which he made, have fitted that vaguer and more general assertion of God as his father? It is impossible to doubt that there is here on Christ's part an assertion that he was God's *own* son, his son *by nature*, as others are his sons by adoption and grace. But this assertion does not come out in our version with at all the clear distinctness which it has in the original.

The other passage is Tit. ii., 13: "Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing *of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.*" This verse, thus punctuated, and this

* See Winer, *Gramm.*, § 22, 7. Meyer demands that it shall *always* be considered emphatic, never equivalent to the "proprius" of later Latin. Yet I can not but see in this an example of that virtuosity, that pushing of matters to the extreme, which not unfrequently mars the exegesis of this very distinguished scholar.

is the punctuation of the edition of 1611, namely, with a comma after "God," does not identify, but clearly distinguishes between "the great God," that is, the Father, and "our Saviour Jesus Christ." I shall not enter into the grammatical questions involved in this verse; they are admirably dealt with by Professor Ellicott, *in loco*, who shows that, while this of our translators must always remain grammatically a possible rendering of the words, it is far more probable that they should be rendered so as to contain an explicit confession of the Godhead of the Son, even as they were taken to do by many of the great teachers of the early Church, namely, thus: "Looking for the blessed hope and glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." Modern editors of the Authorized Version have sought to arrive, so far as they could, at the same result by abolishing the comma after "the great God." But this they have no right to do. The intention of the authors of our version was plainly the other way; and unacknowledged revisions of this kind, even where we may think them made in the right direction, are altogether to be condemned.

I freely acknowledge that I have not in this chapter answered all, or nearly all, the objections which from these several quarters have been made against our version, but I have endeavored to show that some, at least, of those which are counted the strongest, and, as such, are oftenest brought forward, are capable of being successfully rebutted, and would fain draw from this a conclusion that the spirit and temper in which this translation was carried out was, in all its leading features, one of fairness, impartiality, and justice to all.

## CHAPTER XII.

### ON THE BEST MEANS OF CARRYING OUT A REVISION.

I HAVE thus endeavored to make as just an estimate as I could of the merits, and, where such exist, of the defects, of our Authorized Version. In pointing out some of these last, I trust I have nowhere spoken a word inconsistent with the truest reverence for its authors, the profoundest gratitude to them for the treasure with which they have enriched the English Church. Such word I certainly have not intended to utter; and I can truly say, that if a close and minute examination of parts of their work reveals flaws which one had not suspected before, it also makes us conscious how infinite its merits are, discovers to us not a few of these whereof we had hitherto been only partially aware.

A few words in conclusion. They shall be, first, on the difficulties and dangers which manifestly beset a revision; and, secondly, on the manner in which these, or some of these, might be best overcome.

Among these difficulties, I will not more than touch on that of the formation of a Greek text which the revised version should seek to represent; and yet it is a difficulty of enormous magnitude, and lying at the very threshold of the work. Let it once be admitted that any change is to take place, and it will be clearly impossible to rest content with the text which our translators used. Take those cases where every critical edition of later times, and on overwhelming evidence, has preferred some other readings to theirs. Thus, could we, for instance, refuse to change "King *of saints*" into "King *of nations*," Rev. xv., 3? "zeal" into either "toil" or "labor," Col. iv., 13? "carried *about*" into "carried *away*," Heb. xiii., 9? "*an ass*" into "*a son*," Luke xiv., 5? "Why callest thou

me good?" into "Why askest thou me about the good?" Matt. xix., 17? Nor are these cases of overwhelming evidence by any means the hardest. These settle themselves, leaving no ground of appeal on behalf of the displaced reading. But how determine where the authorities are at all nearly balanced? Shall it, for instance, be, "bore *with their manners* in the wilderness," or "bore them *as a nurse* in the wilderness" (Acts xiii., 18)? "serving *the time*," or "serving *the Lord*" (Rom. xii., 11)? "Greeks," or "Grecians" (Acts xi., 20)? with many such problems more.

But these are not all. It is impossible but that other changes must find place, which would take many still more by surprise, and be far more offensive than any of these. Indeed, no other alterations in the English Bible would at all startle and offend to the same degree as would those which must follow from a reconsideration and reconstitution of the Greek text; and this, even though it should be determined to make no single change which has not the consenting authority of *all* the critical editions in its favor. This much certainly, if this work is once taken in hand, could not be avoided; for none, it is to be hoped, would be so cowardly, so distrustful of God's cause if left in his own keeping, so ready to break down the distinctions between God's Word and man's, or to snatch at and profit by unfair advantages, as to suggest that passages, if once it was thoroughly made out that they did not belong to the Word of God, or ought to be read in some other form, should yet be retained as they are, either because the people had become so used to them that a great outcry would ensue at the first discovery of their omission or alteration, or, more abjectly still, because they were serviceable for the stopping of the mouth of some heretic. Every sense of honor revolts at this last suggestion. And yet it is not to be denied that the effect would be startling when some verse with which men all their life long have been familiar was left out, as Acts viii., 37 must be; or when some phrase, which had seemed a precious witness, a *dictum*

*probans* for a central truth, was found now to be so modified as to bear this witness no longer: "the Church *of God*, which he hath purchased with his own blood," for instance, to be changed into "the Church *of the Lord*, etc." (Acts xx., 28);* or "*God* was manifest in the flesh" into "*who* was manifest in the flesh" (1 Tim. iii., 16).† But, satisfying myself with merely indicating this difficulty, which presents itself at the very outset, I pass on to others.

We must never leave out of sight that for a great multitude of readers the English Version is not the translation of an inspired Book, but is itself the inspired Book. And so far, of course, as it is a perfectly adequate counterpart of the original, this is true, since the inspiration is not limited to those Hebrew or Greek words in which the divine message was first communicated to men, but lives on in whatever words are a faithful and full representation of these; nay, in words which fall short of this, to the extent of their adequacy. There, and there only, where any divergence exists between the original and the copy, the copy is less inspired than the original; indeed, is not, to the extent of that divergence, inspired at all. But these distinctions are exactly of a kind which the body of Christian people will not draw, will hardly understand when they are drawn by others. The English Bible is to them all which the Hebrew Old Testament, which the Greek New Testament, is to the devout scholar, and receives from them the same undoubting affiance. They have never realized the fact that the divine utterance was not made at the first in those very English words which they read in their cottages and hear in their church. Who will not allow that the little which this faith of theirs in their English Bible has in excess is nearly or quite harmless? that, on the other hand, the harm would be incalculable of any serious disturbance of this faith, supposing, as might only too easily happen, very much else to be disturbed with it?

* See Tregelles, *The Printed Text of the New Testament*, p. 231, 234.
† Ibid., p. 226–231.

Neither can I count it an indifferent matter that a chief bond, indeed the chiefest, that binds the English Dissenters to us, and us to them, would thus be snapped asunder. Out of the fact that Nonconformity had not for the most part fixed itself into actual and formal separation from the Church till some time after our Authorized Version was made, it has followed that when the Nonconformists parted from us, they carried with them this translation, and continued to use and to cherish it, regarding it as much their own as ours. The Roman Catholics are, I believe, the only body in the country who employ a version of their own. With their exception, the Authorized Version is common ground for all in England who call themselves Christians—is alike the heritage of all. But, even if English Dissenters acknowledged the necessity of a revision, which I conclude from many indications that they do, it is idle to expect that they would accept such at our hands. Two things, then, might happen. Either they would adhere to the old Authorized Version, which is not, indeed, very probable, or they would carry out a revision, it might be two or three, of their own. In either case, the ground of a common Scripture, of an English Bible which they and we hold equally sacred, would be taken from us; the separation and division, which are now the sorrow, and perplexity, and shame of England, would become more marked, more deeply fixed than ever. Then, further, while of course it would be comparatively easy to invite our brethren of the Episcopal Church in America to take share in our revision, yet many causes might hinder their acceptance of this invitation, or their acquiescence in the work as we found it expedient to do it. Thus the issue might only too easily be, that we should lose in respect of them also the common ground of one and the same Scripture, which we now possess. Such a loss, either in regard of the English Dissenters or American churchmen, would not be a slight one, nor one deserving to be regarded with indifference.

Another most serious consideration presents itself. Is it

likely that one revision will satisfy? If conducted with moderation, it will probably leave much untouched about which it will still be possible to raise a question. It can not be but there will be some who will think the revision ought to have been carried much further—who will refuse to accept the compromise, which a revision in any case must prove.* Is it not inevitable that, after a longer or shorter period, another revision, and on that another, will be called for? Will not, in this way, all sense of stability pass away from our English Scripture? And to look at a mere material fact—the Bibles in the hands of our people, in what agreement with one another, after a little while, will they be? It is idle to expect that the great body of our population will keep pace with successive changes, and provide themselves with the latest revision. Inability to meet the expense, or unwillingness to do so, or a love of the old to which they have grown accustomed, a foregone conclusion that the changes are for the worse or that they are immaterial, lack of interest in the subject, will all contribute to hinder this. The inconveniences, and much more than inconveniences, of such a state of things assuredly will not be slight. This prospect, indeed, so little alarms the author of an article in the *Edinburg Review*,† "On the State of the English Bible," that he proposes the institution of a permanent commission, which shall be always altering, always embodying in a new and improved edition the latest allowed results of Biblical criticism. It was startling enough to read somewhere else a proposal that the Authorized Version should be revised once in every fifty years; but this proposal, if one could suppose there was the slightest chance that it would be acceded to, is most alarming of all.

These are the main arguments, as it seems to me, against

* Upon this subject, see some admirable remarks in an article, "Revision of the Authorized Version of the Bible," in the *Christian Remembrancer*, vol. xxxii., p. 467 *sqq.* The discussion on the subject, and on the difficulties which it presents, is excellent throughout.

† October, 1855.

a revision of our version. None will deny their weight. Indeed, there are times when the whole matter presents itself as so full of difficulty and doubtful hazard that one could be well content to resign all gains that would accrue from this revision, and only ask that all things might remain as they are. But this, I am persuaded, is impossible: however we may be disposed to let the question alone, it will not let us alone. It has been too effectually stirred ever again to go to sleep; and the difficulties with which it is surrounded, be they few or many, will have at no distant day to be encountered. The time will come when the perils of remaining where we are will be so manifestly greater than the perils of action, that action will become inevitable. There will be danger in both courses, for that saying of the Latin moralist is a profoundly true one, "Nunquam periclum sine periclo vincitur;" but the lesser danger will have to be chosen, and that lesser danger will wait upon the course which I desire, not that the Church should now take, but should prepare herself for hereafter taking—should regard as one toward which we are inevitably approaching.*

In respect of the actual steps which it will be then advisable to take, I can not think that, even when the matter is seriously undertaken, there should, for a considerable time, be any interference with the English text. Let come together, and, if possible, not of self-will, but with some authorization, royal or ecclesiastical, or both, such a body of scholars and divines as would deserve and would obtain the confidence of the whole Church. Fortunately, no points at issue among ourselves threaten to come into discussion or debate, so that the unhappy divisions of our time would not here add any additional embarrassment to a matter embarrassed enough already. Nay, of such immense importance would

* There is an interesting article in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1849, p. 427 *sqq.*, with the title "Die Bibel nach der deutschen Uebersetzung des D. Martin Luther," dealing with the same questions, in respect of the greatly honored German translation of Luther, as agitate us in respect of our own.

it be to carry with us, in whatever might be done, the whole Christian people of England, that it would be desirable to invite all scholars, all who represented any important portion of the Biblical scholarship in the land, to assist with their suggestions here, even though they might not belong to the Church. Of course they would be asked as scholars, not as Dissenters. But it were a matter so deeply to be regretted that they should revise and we should revise, thus parting company in the one thing which now holds us strongly together, while it would be so hopeless, indeed so unreasonable, to expect that they should accept our revision, having themselves had no voice in it, that we ought not to stand on any punctilios here, but should be prepared rather to sacrifice every thing non-essential for the averting of such a catastrophe. Setting aside, then, the so-called Baptists, who of course could not be invited, seeing that they demand not a translation of the Scripture, but an interpretation, and that in their own sense,* there are no matters of doctrine or even of discipline likely to come into debate which should render it impossible for such Dissenters as accept our doctrinal articles to take a share in this work, as regarded not from its ecclesiastical, but its scholarly point of view. All points like-

* The author of a review, on the whole a courteous one, of this book in a Baptist journal, *The Freeman*, November 17, 1858, assures me that I am mistaken in supposing that the Baptists claim to substitute "dip," "immerse," or "wash" for "baptize" wherever it occurs in the New Testament. "Many scholars among us—indeed, all the most eminent whom we happen to know, are altogether indisposed to alter the word." I find it hard to reconcile this with the fact that in *their* revision, that, namely, of the American Bible Union, "baptize" is always changed into "immerse," and "baptism" into "immersion," and "Baptist" into "Immerser!" Thus, in the Gospel of St. Mark alone, "John was *immersing* in the desert, and preaching the *immersion* of repentance," i., 4; "I indeed *immerse* you in water, but he will *immerse* you in the Holy Spirit," ver. 8; "The head of John the *Immerser*," vi., 25; "He that believeth and is *immersed* shall be saved," xvi., 16; and the same wherever I have examined it. The writer of this article has taken some offense at the phrase "so-called Baptists." Certainly none was intended; but only a protest, the shortest I could make, against being supposed to admit that they who assumed this name more realized the truth of baptism, or otherwise made more of it, than we do ourselves.

ly to come under discussion would be points of pure scholarship, or would only involve that universal Christianity common to them and us; or, if more than this, they would be points about which there is equally a difference of opinion within the Church as in the bodies without it, for instance, as between Arminian and Calvinist, which difference would not be avoided by their absence.

Let, then, such a body as this, inspiring confidence at once by their piety, their learning, and their prudence, draw out such a list of emendations as are lifted beyond all doubt in the eye of every one whose voice has any right to be heard on the matter—eschewing all luxury of emendation, abstaining from all which is not of primary necessity, from much in which they might have fitly allowed themselves, if they had not been building on foundations already laid, and which could not, without great inconvenience, be disturbed—using the same moderation, and even the same self-denial here, which Jerome used in his revision of the Latin. Let them very briefly, but with just as much learned explanation as should be needful, justify these emendations where they were not self-evident. Let them, if this should be their conviction, express the sense of the desirableness that these should at some future day be introduced into the received text, as bringing it into more perfect accord and harmony with the original Scriptures. Having done this, let them leave these emendations to ripen in the public mind, gradually to commend themselves to all students of God's holy Word. Supposing the emendations such as ought to, and would, do this, there would probably, before very long, be a general desire for their admission into the text, and in due time this admission might follow. All abrupt change would thus be avoided—all forcing of alterations on those not as yet prepared to receive them. That which at length came in would excite no surprise, no perplexity, no offense, or, at most, a very small amount of these, having already, in the minds of many, displaced that of which it now at length took openly the room.

It is indeed quite true that "no man, having drunk old wine, straightway desireth new; for he saith, The old is better;" but it is on "straightway" that the emphasis, in this saying of our Lord, must be laid. In those spiritual things to which he intended that we should transfer this saying, a man may, and will, if he is wise, after a while desire the new. It may have a certain unwelcome harshness and austerity at the first; the man may have to overcome that custom which is as a second nature before he heartily affects it. But still, just as the Western Church accepted in a little Jerome's revision of the Latin Version, notwithstanding the opposition which it met at the first,* and even the uproar and extreme confusion in the churches which its first introduction would sometimes cause when some novelty took the place of a reading with which all were familiar, or, to come nearer home, just as our ancestors grew gradually in love with our present translation, churchmen weaning themselves from the Bishops' Bible, and Puritans from the Geneva—as one and the other of these versions fell quite out of use, churchmen and Puritans finally agreeing in the decision, not that the old was better, but the new—so will it be here. What amount of difficulty those who lived in the reign of James the First found in reconciling themselves to the change it is hard to say. That the old versions had struck deep root in the affections of many is evident from the fact that the Bishops' Bible, if I mistake not, sometimes, and the Geneva Bible certainly many times, were reprinted, even after they had been formally superseded by the present version. With the exception of this testimony, we have singularly little on the subject in the contemporary religious literature, the very absence of such notices seeming to imply that the difficulty was not very great. In one respect it ought to be much smaller now, inasmuch as, careful as King James's translators were not to change wantonly, and for mere change's sake, still the alterations which they made were consider-

* See Van Ess, *Geschichte der Vulgata*, Tübingen, 1824, p. 109–145.

able, many times more than would be necessary or desirable now.

And even if it were never thought good that this final step should be taken, that these emendations should be transplanted into the text, if I am mistaken in imagining such an issue one sooner or later not to be averted, what an invaluable help to earnest students of Scripture such a volume might prove! With a little management, its more learned portions might be so separated off in notes as to leave the substance of it accessible even to the English reader, who might thus be put in possession, though in a somewhat roundabout and less effectual way, of all which a revision would have given him. If, too, he had been shaken by rumors of the inaccuracy of his English Bible, he might here see, on the warrant of those best qualified to judge, how very little way this inaccuracy reached, in what comparatively unessential matters it moved; or, if this could not always be asserted, yet this much might, that a revision of his Bible would not draw after it, even in the minutest particular, a revision of his creed. Granting that nothing else should come of it, such a volume might prove an effectual check to wanton and mischievous agitations, to disquieting suggestions that a revised Bible would present God's truth in other lights from those in which it is presented now, and, as such, the advantage of it might be great.

Nor is it at all impossible that the very unsettlement of men's minds, consequent upon the stirring of this question, might be found to bring with it some compensating gain. This putting to the proof of the words in which God's message had hitherto been conveyed to them, might it not for some be a motive to a more accurate and thoughtful considering of the message itself? It would not, I imagine, be for most of us unprofitable to discover that the words in which the truth has hitherto reached us are exchangeable for other, in some places, it may be, for better, words. The shock, unpleasant and unwelcome as it would perhaps prove at the

first, might yet be a startling of many from a dull, lethargic, unprofitable reading of God's Word; a breaking up of that hard crust of formality which so easily overgrows our study of the Scripture; while in the rousing of the energies of the mind to defend the old, or, before admitting, thoroughly to test the new, more insight into it might be gained, with more grasp of its deeper meaning, than years of lazy familiarity would have given. For, indeed, according to a profound proverb, "what is ever seen is never seen;" and a daily familiarity with Scripture, full as it is of innumerable blessings, carries, like each other privilege, its dangers with it—dangers which the course here recommended might contribute much to remove.

Thus much I have thought it desirable to say on this momentous subject. I am not so sanguine as to believe that, with all precautions taken, great and serious, it might be quite unexpected, difficulties would not attend this enterprise. There would need no little wisdom and prudence to bring it to a successful end. Still it might be humbly hoped that by Him who is ever with his Church this prudence and this wisdom would be granted. And, lastly, let me observe that when we make much of the inconveniences which *must* wait upon any such step, we ought never to leave out of sight their transitory character, as contrasted with the permanent character of the gain. How large an amount of inconvenience men have willingly encountered with only some worldly object in view, where they have felt that the inconvenience would be merely temporary, the gain enduring—as in the rectification of the coinage, the readjustment of the calendar. And here too, serious as the inconvenience might be at the first, and during the period of transition, still it would every day be growing slighter; it would be but for a few years at the longest; while the gain, always supposing the work to be well and wisely done, would be forever; it would be riches and strength for the English Church to the end of time.

# APPENDIX.

At a time like the present, when the subject of the Revision of the Authorized Version is occupying so much attention, it might be interesting to some to have before them a tolerably correct list of works bearing on the subject, which have been published in this country or in America, either urging a revision or dissuading one, or showing by actual example how such might be carried out. The list is as complete as I could make it, and thus includes not merely works of importance, but also some which are of comparatively slight value or of none. I have not considered that entirely new translations belong fitly to this list, but only those which accept our Version as a basis and point of departure, and thus in their agreement with, or dissent from it, may be regarded as offering a running commentary and criticism upon it.

An Essay toward the Amendment of the last English Translation of the Bible, by Robert Gell, D.D. Folio. London, 1659.

Errata of the Protestant Bible, by Thomas Ward. 4to. London, 1688.

An Essay for a New Translation of the Bible, by H. R. [Hugh Ross, see Todd's *Life of Bishop Walton*, vol. i., p. 134], a Minister of the Church of England. 1702.

A New and Literal Translation of all the Books of the Old and New Testament, with Notes critical and explanatory, by Anthony Purver. Folio, 2 vols. London. 1764.

Prospectus of a New Translation of the Holy Bible, by the Rev. Alexander Geddes. 4to. Glasgow, 1786.

Letter to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of London [Bishop Lowth], being an Appendix to a Prospectus of a New Translation, by the same. 4to. London, 1787.

Reasons for revising by Authority our present Version of the Bible. 8vo. Cambridge, 1788.

Observations on the Expediency of revising the present English Version of the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, by John Symonds, Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. 4to. Cambridge, 1789.

A Historical View of the English Biblical Translations, the Expediency of revising by Authority our present Translation, and the means of executing such a Revision, by William Newcome, Bishop of Waterford. 8vo. Dublin, 1792.

Observations on the Expediency of revising the present English Version of the Epistles, by the same. 4to. Cambridge, 1794.

Letter to the Bishop of Ely on the Subject of a New and Authoritative Translation of the Holy Scriptures, by George Burges. 8vo. Peterborough, 1796.

Remarks upon the Critical Principles adopted by Writers who have at various times recommended a New Translation of the Bible as expedient and necessary, by Archbishop Lawrence. 8vo. Oxford, 1820.

Reasons why a New Translation of the Bible should not be published without a previous Examination of all the material Passages which may be supposed to be misinterpreted. 8vo. Durham, 1816.

Biblical Gleanings, by Thomas Wemyss. 8vo. York, 1816.

Reasons in favor of a New Translation of the Holy Scriptures, by Sir J. B. Burgess. 8vo. London, 1819.

A Vindication of our Authorized Translation of the Bible, by the Rev. Henry John Todd. 8vo. London, 1819.

The Holy Bible in the Common Version, with Amendments of the Language, by Noah Webster. 8vo. New Haven, 1833.

A Supplement to the Authorized English Version of the New Testament, by the Rev. Frederick Henry Scrivener. London, 1845.

Hints for an Improved Translation of the New Testament, by the Rev. James Scholefield. 3d edition. London, 1850.

A Vindication of the Authorized Version of the English Bible, by the Rev. S. C. Malan. London, 1856.

Biblical Revision: Considerations in favor of a Revised Translation of Holy Scripture, by Edward Slater. London, 1856.

The State of the English Bible, by the Rev. W. Harness. London, 1856.

Notes on the proposed Amendment of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures, by William Selwyn, Canon of Ely. 8vo. Cambridge, 1856.

Bible Revision and Translation: an Argument for holding fast what we have, by the Rev. John Cumming. 8vo. London, 1856.

A Plea for the Revisal of the Translation of the Bible of 1611, by F. Iliff. 8vo. Sunderland, 1857.

The Gospel according to St. John, after the Authorized Version, newly compared with the original Greek and revised, by Five Clergymen. 8vo. 2d edition. London, 1857.

The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, after the Authorized Version, newly compared with the original Greek and revised, by Five Clergymen. 8vo. London, 1858.

The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians, after the Authorized Version, newly compared with the original Greek and revised, by Five Clergymen. 8vo. London, 1858.

A Revised English Bible the Want of the Church and the Demand of the Age, by John R. Beard, D.D. Small 8vo. London, 1857.

Revision of the Authorized Version of the Bible: an Article in the *Christian Remembrancer*, 1856, p. 451–499.

The New Testament, revised from the Authorized Version with the aid of other Translations, by Edgar Taylor. Small 8vo. London. No date.

A Plea for an Edition of the Authorized Version of Holy Scripture, with explanatory and emendatory marginal Notes, by the Rev. G. E. Biber. 8vo. London, 1857.

Reasons for holding fast the Authorized English Version of the Bible, by Alexander M'Caul, D.D. London, 1857.

Revision of the Holy Scriptures; an Argument against Objectors, by the Rev. H. Burgess. 8vo. 1857.

The English Bible and our Duty with regard to it, by Philalethes. 8vo. Dublin, 1857.

The Epistle to the Hebrews, translated from the Greek on the Basis of the Common English Version, with Notes. 4to. New York, American Bible Union, 1857.

The Epistle to the Ephesians, translated from the Greek on the Basis of the Common English Version, with Notes. 4to. New York, American Bible Union, 1857.

The Gospel according to Mark, translated from the Greek on the Basis of the Common English Version, with Notes. 4to. New York, American Bible Union, 1858.

The Second Epistle of Peter, the Epistles of John and Judas, and the Revelation, translated from the Greek on the Basis of the Common English Version, with Notes. 4to. London, 1856.

The Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians, translated from the Greek on the Basis of the Common English Version, with Notes. 4to. London, 1858.

# INDEX.

## I. PRINCIPAL TEXTS CONSIDERED.


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Matt. v., 15, 16 | 85 |
| " v., 21 | 108 |
| " vi., 25 | 36 |
| " vi., 27 | 134 |
| " viii., 20 | 147 |
| " ix., 36 | 108 |
| " x., 4 | 147 |
| " x., 9 | 125 |
| " x., 16 | 109 |
| " xii., 23 | 132 |
| " xiv., 8 | 148 |
| " xiv., 13 | 149 |
| " xiv., 24 | 28 |
| " xvi., 15 | 55 |
| " xviii., 33 | 85 |
| " xix., 17 | 176 |
| " xx., 1, 11 | 85 |
| " xx., 23 | 169 |
| " xxi., 41 | 83 |
| " xxii., 3, 4, 13 | 91 |
| " xxiii., 24 | 149 |
| " xxiii., 25 | 43 |
| " xxviii., 11 | 99 |
| Mark i., 10 | 28 |
| " ii., 18 | 126 |
| " iii., 18 | 147 |
| " vi., 20 | 109 |
| " vi., 4 | 110 |
| " xi., 4 | 151 |
| " xi., 17 | 101 |
| " xii., 26 | 151 |
| " xiv., 72 | 99 |
| " xvi., 2 | 127 |
| Luke i., 19 | 127 |
| " i., 59 | 126 |
| " ii., 49 | 135 |
| " v., 6 | 126 |
| " viii., 31 | 80 |
| " xi., 17 | 99 |
| " xi., 48 | 43 |
| " xii., 25 | 134 |
| " xiii., 2 | 127 |
| Luke xiii., 7 | 37 |
| " xiv., 7 | 126 |
| " xvi., 1 | 101 |
| " xvii., 21 | 110 |
| " xviii., 12 | 125 |
| " xxi., 19 | 125 |
| " xxiii., 33 | 73 |
| " xxiii., 42 | 122 |
| John i., 3, 4 | 106 |
| " ii., 8, 9 | 85 |
| " iii., 10 | 116 |
| " iii., 11, 32 | 84 |
| " iv., 6 | 120 |
| " iv., 29 | 132 |
| " v., 16 | 128 |
| " v., 18 | 173 |
| " viii., 58 | 131 |
| " ix., 31 | 55 |
| " x., 16 | 96 |
| " xii., 6 | 135 |
| " xiv., 18 | 110 |
| " xvi., 8 | 111 |
| " xvii., 12 | 96 |
| Acts i., 4 | 106 |
| " ii., 47 | 171 |
| " iii., 1 | 126 |
| " iii., 13, 26 | 95 |
| " iv., 27, 30 | 95 |
| " vii., 45 | 67 |
| " x., 12 | 129 |
| " xi., 20 | 176 |
| " xii., 4 | 45 |
| " xii., 19 | 105 |
| " xiii., 18 | 176 |
| " xiv., 15 | 151 |
| " xvii., 1 | 117 |
| " xvii., 18 | 81, 136 |
| " xvii., 19 | 69 |
| " xvii., 21 | 29 |
| " xvii., 22 | 152 |
| " xvii., 23 | 38, 82 |
| " xix., 37 | 39 |
| Acts xx., 28 | 177 |
| " xxi., 3 | 102 |
| " xxi., 15 | 39 |
| " xxiii., 27 | 99 |
| " xxv., 5 | 152 |
| " xxvi., 2, 7 | 119, 120 |
| " xxvii., 9 | 100 |
| " xxvii., 10, 21 | 84 |
| " xxviii., 4 | 124 |
| Rom. i., 26, 27 | 137 |
| " ii., 14 | 119 |
| " ii., 22 | 152 |
| " iii., 25 | 93 |
| " iv., 1–24 | 80 |
| " v., 15, 17 | 117 |
| " viii., 21 | 72 |
| " xi., 2 | 151 |
| " xi., 8 | 153 |
| " xii., 11 | 176 |
| " xv., 4 | 84 |
| 1 Cor. iii., 17 | 82 |
| " iv., 4 | 40 |
| " xi., 27 | 166 |
| " xiii., 12 | 138 |
| 2 Cor. ii., 14 | 139 |
| " ii., 17 | 140 |
| " iii., 5, 6 | 83 |
| " v., 10 | 129 |
| " xi., 3 | 123 |
| Gal. i., 6 | 122 |
| " i., 18 | 154 |
| " ii., 6, 9 | 160 |
| " iii., 22 | 83 |
| " v., 6 | 166 |
| " v., 19, 20 | 154 |
| Ephes. iii., 14, 15 | 26 |
| " iv., 3 | 40 |
| " iv., 18 | 102 |
| " iv., 29 | 155 |

| | Page |
|---|---|
| PHIL. ii., 3 | 56 |
| " ii., 13 | 84 |
| " ii., 15 | 128 |
| " iii., 5 | 120 |
| " iv., 3 | 156 |
| COL. i., 13 | 72 |
| " i., 15 | 157 |
| " i., 16 | 128 |
| " ii., 8 | 142 |
| " ii., 18 | 111 |
| " ii., 23 | 142 |
| " iv., 13 | 175 |
| 1 THESS. iv., 6 | 112 |
| " v., 22 | 102 |
| 2 THESS. ii., 3 | 106 |
| " ii., 6 | 84 |
| 1 TIM. iii., 16 | 177 |
| " iv., 1, 2, 3 | 158 |
| " v., 4 | 41 |
| " v., 13 | 106 |
| " vi., 2 | 117 |
| " vi., 5 | 103 |
| " vi., 8 | 143 |
| " vi., 9 | 43 |
| 1 TIM. vi., 10 | 119 |
| TITUS ii., 13 | 173 |
| HEB. ii., 16 | 144 |
| " iv., 1 | 105 |
| " iv., 8 | 67 |
| " v., 2 | 113 |
| " v., 8 | 54 |
| " v., 11 | 131 |
| " vi., 7 | 121 |
| " ix., 5 | 56 |
| " ix., 23 | 103 |
| " x., 34 | 170 |
| " x., 38 | 171 |
| " xi., 10 | 116 |
| " xi., 13 | 104 |
| " xi., 29 | 159 |
| " xii., 23 | 133 |
| " xiii., 4 | 165 |
| " xiii., 9 | 175 |
| JAMES i., 4, 5 | 84 |
| " i., 13 | 100 |
| " i., 26 | 160 |
| " ii., 2, 3 | 85 |
| " iii., 5 | 145 |
| JAMES v., 9 | 45 |
| 1 PET. i., 17 | 105 |
| " ii., 4, 5 | 42 |
| " iii., 16 | 161 |
| " iv., 9 | 45 |
| 2 PET. i., 5–7 | 123 |
| " i., 14 | 127 |
| " iii., 12 | 113 |
| " iii., 16 | 29 |
| 1 JOHN v., 15 | 55 |
| JUDE 12 | 161 |
| REV. i., 18 | 22 |
| " iii., 2 | 145 |
| " iv., 4 | 80 |
| " iv., 5 | 124 |
| " iv., 6–9 | 91 |
| " vii., 14 | 115 |
| " xv., 2 | 120 |
| " xv., 3 | 175 |
| " xvi., 2 | 44 |
| " xxi., 12 | 57 |
| " xxi., 19, 20 | 70 |


## II. GREEK WORDS.


| | |
|---|---|
| Ἄβυσσος | 80 |
| ἄγγελος | 23 |
| ᾅδης | 21, 22 |
| ἀκέραιος | 109 |
| ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος | 25 |
| ἄμφοδος | 151 |
| ἀπάγω | 105 |
| ἀπείθεια | 92 |
| ἀπιστία | 92 |
| ἀποκαραδοκία | 106 |
| ἄρειος πάγος | 69 |
| ἀσσάριον | 63 |
| αὐλή | 96 |
| βαστάζω | 136 |
| βάτος | 151 |
| γέεννα | 21, 22 |
| γίνομαι | 130 |
| γραμματεύς | 63 |
| δεισιδαίμων | 152 |
| δελεάζω | 88 |
| διά | 121 |
| διάκονος | 91 |
| δίνυλίζω | 150 |
| διχοστασία | 154 |
| δοκέω | 160 |
| δολόω | 141 |
| δοῦλος | 91 |
| δυνατός | 152 |
| εἶδος | 102 |
| εἰς | 122 |
| ἐλέγω | 111 |
| ἐν | 122 |
| ἐνεργέομαι | 166 |
| ἐπί | 120 |
| ἐπιγινώσκω, ἐπίγνωσις | 27 |
| ἐπιλαμβάνομαι | 144 |
| Ἑρμῆς | 63 |
| ἐρριμμένος | 108, 109 |
| ἔσοπτρον | 138 |
| ἑτερόφθαλμος | 20, 21 |
| εὐκαιρέω | 28 |
| ὑπερίστατος | 25 |
| ζῶον | 90, 91 |
| ἡλικία | 134 |
| θηρίον | 91 |
| θριαμβεύω | 139 |
| θρόνος | 80 |
| ἱεροσυλέω | 153 |
| ἱστορέω | 154 |
| Κανανίτης | 148 |
| καπηλεύω | 140 |
| καταβραβεύω | 112 |
| κατάνυξις | 153 |
| καταπίνω | 159 |
| καταργέω | 89 |
| κατασκήνωσις | 147 |
| κάτοπτρον | 138 |
| κλίνη | 110 |
| κοδράντης | 63 |

| | Page |
|---|---|
| κόφινος | 94 |
| κτάομαι | 125 |
| κύριος | 78 |
| λόγος | 19 |
| λογίζομαι | 80 |
| μάγος | 23 |
| μετάνοια | 18 |
| μετριοπαθέω | 113 |
| μονόφθαλμος | 20 |
| νεωκόρος | 63 |
| ὁμοιοπαθής | 152 |
| ὀρφανός | 110 |
| παῖς Θεοῦ | 95 |
| παράκλητος | 23 |
| πάρεσις | 96 |
| πεῖν | 149 |
| ποίμνη | 96 |
| προβιβάζω | 148, 149 |
| πρωτοτόκος | 157 |
| πώρωσις | 102 |
| σάρδιος, σάρδινος | 71 |
| σέβασμα | 38 |
| σκέπασμα | 143 |
| σοφός | 92, 93 |
| σπερμολόγος | 136 |
| σπυρίς | 94 |
| συλαγωγέω | 142 |
| συντηρέω | 109, 110 |
| τηρέω | 97 |
| ὕλη | 145 |
| ὑπόδειγμα | 103 |
| φαίνομαι | 129, 160 |
| φλύαρος | 106 |
| φθινοπωρινός | 161, 162 |
| φρόνιμος | 93 |
| φυλάσσω | 96 |


## III. OTHER WORDS.


| | |
|---|---|
| Allow | 43 |
| Alms | 54 |
| Apollo, Apollos | 69 |
| Babbler | 136 |
| Beast | 90 |
| Bribery | 43 |
| By | 40 |
| By-and-by | 44 |
| Calvary | 73 |
| Canaanite | 147, 148 |
| Candy | 107 |
| Carriage | 39 |
| Cherubims | 56 |
| Chrysolite | 71 |
| Chrysoprasus | 71 |
| Church | 39 |
| Comforter | 24 |
| Convince | 111 |
| Cretes, Cretians | 69 |
| Cumber | 37 |
| Depart | 43 |
| Devotion | 38 |
| Each | 56, 57 |
| Easter | 45 |
| Elias, Elijah | 66 |
| Endeavor | 40 |
| Every | 56, 57 |
| Flix | 59 |
| Fourmiller | 25 |
| Goodman of the House | 85 |
| Grudge | 44 |
| Idol | 167 |
| Image | 167 |
| Its | 52, 53 |
| Jesus | 67 |
| Jewry | 45 |
| Joshua | 67 |
| Kinred | 59 |
| Lively | 42 |
| Mercurius | 63 |
| Miletum | 70 |
| Moe, more | 59 |
| Nazarene | 107 |
| Nazarite | 107 |
| Nephew | 41 |
| Noisome | 43 |
| Often | 54 |
| Paraclete | 24 |
| Pattern | 103 |
| Pavaner, pavonear | 25 |
| Pergamos | 70 |
| Pœnitentia | 18 |
| Primesautier | 26 |
| Reflexion | 49 |
| Religious | 152 |
| Reprove | 111 |
| Resipiscentia | 18 |
| Riches | 54 |
| Sardine stone | 71 |
| Sardius | 71 |
| Sedition | 154 |
| Sermo | 18 |
| Shamefastness | 59 |
| Slave | 92 |
| Thought | 36 |
| Three Taverns | 71 |
| Timotheus, Timothy | 69 |
| Trifler | 106 |
| Trouble | 98 |
| Urbane | 68 |
| Verbum | 18 |
| Which | 58 |
| Wizard | 23 |


THE END.

CONSIDERATIONS

ON

# THE REVISION

OF THE

# ENGLISH VERSION

OF THE

# NEW TESTAMENT.

BY

C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D.,

BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

NEW YORK:

HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS,

FRANKLIN SQUARE.

1873.

TO THE MEMORY,

EVER FRESH AND EVER TO BE HONORED,

OF

# WILLIAM TYNDALE,

OF

GLOUCESTERSHIRE.

# PREFACE.

The following work is written to supply a need which, at the present time, may be felt by many. We seem to need a Hand-book which, in an easy and popular manner, and yet, at the same time, with reasonable accuracy, might put before us the whole subject of the Revision of the Holy Scriptures.

This work aspires to be such a Hand-book in reference to the New Testament. It has two main objects: *First*, to give the general reader that competent knowledge of the subject which may enable him to enter into the present movement with interest and intelligence. *Secondly*, to place on record some experiences that were acquired by the writer when engaged with others in an attempt to revise some portions of the Authorized Version of the New Testament. Such experiences, it is humbly believed, will be found useful at the present time, and may be perhaps permitted to minister some guidance to individual scholars who may be called upon to take part in the Revision now recommended by Convocation.

These are the two objects of the present work—to place generally before the reader the work that has to be done, and also to offer to those who may be actually engaged in it some few hints as to the mode of carrying out the work.

It is proper to state that the work has been composed in the midst of many other pressing duties and occupations; and that hours snatched from daily work, or secured before the day's duties could commence, are all that have been at the disposal of the writer for the compilation of these notes and considerations. It is hoped that no serious inaccuracies will be found on the pages that follow, but it is frankly owned that the work has been written promptly—for the need seemed real—and that it has been written concurrently with some of the events to which it alludes. It was commenced a short time after the first meeting of Convocation this year, and it was concluded shortly after its second meeting. The time has thus been limited; but if the book was to do any good, or to exercise any useful influence, its publication could not have been longer delayed.

It does not seem necessary to make remarks on any part, except on the samples of revision that have been, somewhat courageously, submitted to the judgment of the reader. Great care has been bestowed upon them, but it is felt very honestly that they themselves will probably disclose departures from principles that may have been urged a few pages before. It must be so. The individual reviser is always liable to subjective influences that give a tinge to his judgment when the special passage is under his consideration, and the present reviser can not dare to hope that he himself, even in these few chapters, has proved to be free from them. So the passages are given honestly as samples, and nothing more; not as the writer's ideal of a true revision, but as the best exemplification he could give of his own rules.

The critical scholar is thus asked kindly to pass his judgment on these passages, as being what is here specified, and as claiming to be nothing more.

This small volume is now offered to those who are interested in the subject of Revision, and also, with all humility, is placed before the Church at large as a small effort in a great cause that will soon largely occupy the thoughts, and, it is hoped, will receive the prayers of all earnest and devout readers of the Holy Bible.

May the blessing of God rest on the great and holy cause; and if it be not presumptuous to add the words, may it also be vouchsafed to this contribution to the general subject, humbly offered by one whose heart, at any rate, is thoroughly in the cause and in the work.

C. J. Gloucester and Bristol.

*London*, May 23, 1870.

# CONTENTS.


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Introduction | 11 |
| II. | The Critical Value of the Text of the Authorized Version. | 33 |
| III. | Leading Characteristics of the Authorized Version | 52 |
| IV. | Nature and Limits of Revision | 85 |
| V. | Amount of Corrections likely to be Introduced | 107 |
| VI. | Objections to Revision, Valid and Invalid | 151 |
| VII. | Best Manner of Proceeding with the Work | 165 |

# REVISION

OF THE

# ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT.

## CHAPTER I.

### INTRODUCTION.

Recent movement in the question.

On the 10th of February in the present year [1870] the following resolution, proposed by the Bishop of Winchester and seconded by the writer of these pages, was carried unanimously by both houses of the Convocation of Canterbury, viz., "To report upon the desirableness of a Revision of the Authorized Version of the Old and New Testament, whether by marginal notes or otherwise, in all those passages where plain and clear errors, whether in the Hebrew or Greek text originally adopted by the translators, or in the translations made from the same, shall, on due investigation, be found to exist."

That such a resolution will in due time be followed by systematic and organized effort in the actual work of revision can hardly be doubted. The general tone of the discussion, the prevailing unanimity, though not without a full recognition of the difficulties that surround the question,* the deep-

* The difficulties and leading objections were stated both by the Bishop of Winchester and the Bishop of St. David's. The latter, with his usual acuteness, gave prominence to the only objection, which, as will be seen below (see chap. vii.), has any real weight, viz., that such a revision might involve the necessity of continual revisions. The bishop, however, fully supported the resolution, and expressed his belief that a judicious revision would be a great advantage both in regard of the public and private reading of the Scriptures. See the report in the *Guardian* for Feb. 16, and in the *John Bull* for Feb. 12, p. 170.

ening interest in the subject that has already shown itself, the expressions of public opinion in the leading journals,* all point to one certain issue—that ere long the serious and responsible work of revision will actually be taken in hand. We are the more confirmed in this view when we take fairly into consideration, first, the circumstances under which the subject has been brought forward, and, secondly, the partially forgotten fact that we are now only resuming a discussion which seriously occupied public attention twelve or thirteen years ago, and which was only then suspended owing to a sort of general feeling that we had hardly at that time the men or the materials forthcoming for an immediate commencement of the work. There was, however, a sort of tacit agreement that, whenever in God's providence a fresh call should seem to be addressed to us, that call should be humbly and reverently attended to, and the discussion resumed.† That call has certainly been made, and the time, as many reasons would seem to suggest, is not only ripe, but convenient for a further consideration of the question, and even for the commencement of the important work. Let us shortly consider both the circumstances of the present call, and the general aspects of the former discussion of the subject, as far as they may throw any light upon our present position and our hopes of further advance.

Now, in the first place, it can hardly be denied that the

* A leading article of some importance will be found in the *Times* for Feb. 18. Various letters have also appeared in the same paper, some of considerable ability and cogency of argument—*e.g.*, on Feb. 26, by Dr. Scott, and by a "Hertfordshire Incumbent" on Feb. 21 and March 10, and by "Anglicanus" on March 9. The views of Dissenters are well expressed in an article in *The Freeman* for Feb. 18, p. 133, and certainly deserve attention.

† No better instance can be given of the prevalence of this feeling at the time than the general design and expressions of the revision of St. John's Gospel and several of St. Paul's Epistles by *Five Clergymen*, the first edition of the first part of which appeared in 1857. The writers state clearly in their introductory preface that they were doing their present work more by way of giving a sample of the manner in which they believed revision ought to be performed, than of preparing themselves formally to undertake the great work. See *Preface to Revised Translation of St. John*, p. ii. seq.

call to reconsider the subject has been made from a very unexpected quarter. No one, except those who very closely observe the directions and librations of modern religious thought, could have expected that a resolution, such as we have already referred to, would have been proposed in the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, and, when proposed, so readily and even joyfully accepted.* It might have been said *à priori* that the way in which the question had been disposed of thirteen years ago supplied but little hope that it would have received better treatment at the present time. As the contrast is instructive, we may devote a few sentences to a short notice of what took place in Convocation in reference to the subject of revision when the question was last formally brought forward.

Earlier proceedings in Convocation.

On February 1, 1856, notice was given by Canon Selwyn that a petition would be proposed to the Upper House of Convocation requesting them to take into consideration an address to the crown, praying her majesty to appoint a commission for receiving and suggesting amendments in the Authorized Version of the Scriptures. The notice, it must be confessed, was rather wide and ambitious,† and, not improbably, found but moderate favor at that

* The manner in which the message from the Upper House directing the appointment of a joint committee was received by the Lower House may be regarded as very distinctly showing how much, in the thirteen or fourteen silent years that have elapsed since the subject was last discussed, the whole question has ripened in the general minds of Churchmen. See the *Guardian* for Feb. 16, p. 198.

† The exact terms of the notice of motion were as follows:

"To propose a petition to the Upper House requesting his grace and their lordships to take into their consideration the subject of an address to the crown, praying that her most gracious majesty may be pleased to appoint a body of learned men well skilled in the original languages of the Holy Scriptures—

"To consider such amendments of the Authorized Version as have been already proposed, and to receive suggestions from all persons who may be willing to offer them.

"To communicate with foreign scholars on difficult passages when it may be deemed advisable.

time among the members of Convocation. It had attracted, however, some attention, and in the July of the same year was alluded to by Mr. Heywood in his speech on this subject in the House of Commons.* In the February of the following year it reappeared, but in a more modest and practical form.† The original motion was withdrawn, and the request limited to the appointment of a joint committee of both houses, which was to be empowered to deliberate on the improvement of the Authorized Version, and to publish the results of their inquiry. But even this proposal, moderate as it was, failed to secure general assent even on the part of those whose knowledge of sacred criticism and exegesis might have been supposed likely to predispose them to a favorable consideration of the movement. Though the subject had been abundantly discussed in the leading periodical literature of the day,‡ and could in no way be considered as new either

"To examine the marginal readings which appear to have been introduced into some editions since the year 1611.

"To point out such words and phrases as have either changed their meaning or become obsolete in the lapse of time; and

"To report from time to time the progress of their work, and the amendments which they may be prepared to recommend." See *Journal of Convocation* for 1856, vol. ii., p. 92.

The subject of the marginal readings referred to in the fourth clause was noticed, but very briefly, three years later in the Upper House. See *Chronicle of Convocation* for 1859, p. 251 seq.

* On July 22, 1856, Mr. Heywood moved an address praying the crown to issue a royal commission (1) to consider amendments that had been proposed in our present version; (2) to receive suggestions from those willing to offer them; (3) to point out errors and obsolete words, and to report accordingly. The motion was opposed by Sir George Grey and withdrawn. See *Hansard's Debates* (3d Series), vol. cxliii., p. 122.

† The amended proposal was as follows:

"To request the Upper House to take into consideration the appointment of a joint committee of both houses to deliberate upon the best means of bringing under review the suggestions made during the two centuries and a half for the still further improvement of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scripture, and of publishing the results of the inquiry." See *Journal of Convocation* for 1856, vol. ii., p. 362.

‡ Of the many articles that appeared at the period referred to, or shortly before it, we may specify those which deserved, and received, considerable attention, and certainly produced some effect at the time, viz., *Edinburg Re-*

to the Church or the country, still it was more than the conservatism of the House was then able to accept. An amendment was placed on the notice-board by Canon Wordsworth,* which still further limited the proposal by the provision that alterations that might be recommended were not to appear in the text, but only in the margin. The *coup de grace* was given by Archdeacon Denison, who added a further amendment to the effect that it was not desirable to give any encouragement to any alterations whatever, whether in the text or in the margin.† The subject then appears to have dropped through.

When we contrast this treatment of the question with that which it has lately received, we can not help feeling surprised at the striking change of sentiment. On the present occasion not only has the proposal of revision been favorably entertained by the Southern Convocation, but even reintroduced into that conservative body, and, when thus reintroduced, warmly welcomed; nay, more, the original proposal of the Bishop of Winchester was at once amplified.‡ Our

*view* for October, 1853, vol. cii., p. 419 seq.; *Christian Remembrancer* for Dec., 1856, vol. xxxii., p. 451 seq.; *Westminster Review* for Jan., 1857, vol. xi., p. 134. In the interval between that period and the present time the articles have been very few; we may, however, specify *Edinburg Review* for Jan., 1865, p. 104 seq., in which the subject is discussed in an easy and readable article, apparently by a writer of known reputation. The leading treatises that appeared about the time referred to will be found noticed in an excellent article by Professor Plumptre in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii., p. 1680.

* The amendment was as follows:

"That as to the question which has been brought under the notice of this House concerning the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures, it is not desirable to countenance any efforts to make changes in the text of the same, but that any alterations or additions which it may be deemed expedient by competent authority to be adopted, should be confined to the margin, and not be introduced into the text." See *Journal of Convocation*, vol. ii., p. 363.

† The exact terms of this concluding amendment were:

"That it is not expedient that this House give any encouragement to any alteration or modification of the Authorized Version, whether by way of insertion in the text, marginal note, or otherwise." See *Journal of Convocation*, vol. ii., p. 363.

‡ The original proposal of the Bishop of Winchester, as seconded by the

resolution, as first brought before the House, was limited to the New Testament. It was immediately extended to the Old Testament with an amount of assent that could never have been expected, and never could have been given if the real necessity for revision had not been very sensibly felt by all present. It may indeed be doubted whether this enlargement of the proposal was in itself wholly desirable. It may be very reasonably urged that it would have seemed at first sight more prudent to commence with a portion of the Holy Scripture, with the criticism and interpretation of which we are certainly more familiar than with that of the remaining part.* Be this, however, as it may, the general feeling of the Southern Convocation has been very clearly expressed, and that, too, in a manner and with a promptitude that could hardly have been expected, except by those who closely watch the movements of public opinion. Such a fact is very significant, and seems certainly to point to the conclusion that there is in the minds of those fully qualified to form an opinion, and not likely to favor innovations, a growing conviction that the time has at length arrived, and that measures ere long must be taken for such a revision as will bring our venerable version more closely into harmony with the inspired Original.†

Former discussions of the subject.

The general aspects of the former discussion of the subject, thirteen years ago, seem also to point in the same direction. The efforts of revision at that

Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, only extended to the New Testament, but was at once extended to the Old Testament by the Bishop of Llandaff and others. See *Guardian* for Feb. 16, p. 193 seq. The extension was agreed to unanimously.

* There is, we are afraid, only too much truth in the remark of Professor Plumptre, that relatively Hebrew was more studied in the early part of the 17th century than it is now. See Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. iii., p. 1682.

† Some very sensible remarks on the subject of the revision will be found in the *Quarterly Review* for April, 1870, vol. cxxviii., p. 129 seq. The article, which is of considerable interest, did not appear till the text of the greater part of the present volume had been written. Any similarities of opinion or sentiment may therefore be considered as due to the independent though coincident convictions of two separate writers.

time, as several of us who then took part in the work probably well remember, were almost confessedly preparatory and tentative. It was very generally felt at the time that the question was not ripe for solution, and that, though it was right and proper to do our best in advancing the cause of revision, yet that time must elapse before the work could be formally and authoritatively undertaken. Even those who entered with some ardor into the movement, and were at first unwilling to believe that it would ever cease till a revised version was in the hands of every earnest Englishman, soon showed a consciousness that there must be a time for maturation, and that first impulses must be content simply to prepare the way, and even by failure to demonstrate how and under what limitations the work itself was finally to be accomplished.* We all saw, more or less clearly, that the movement in which we were then engaged would, by the nature of the case, become suspended, that there would be a pause, a time for reconsideration of the work actually done, and then, after this pause, that the movement would recommence, and go on uninterruptedly to the end. This is commonly the history of all great undertakings, and will, in all probability, be the history of the future revision of the Authorized Version.

A very little consideration will show that such a forecast was natural and reasonable. The movement at that time was essentially a *scholars' movement.* The works of Dean Alford, Archbishop Trench, and others, had awakened a vivid

* It may be noticed that even after the favorable reception of the Revised Version of the Gospel of St. John, the five clergymen who took part in it still speak of their work as fortunate if it has "succeeded in striking the key-note upon which any authoritative Revision of the English Bible, *hereafter to be made*, is to be based." *Pref. to Revised Version of the Epistle to the Romans*, p. iv. The impression on our minds was that we were doing work for the future, not for the then present time. This feeling had a very good effect upon us. We did our work slowly, and without any reference to current expectations, or any desire to catch passing opportunities. When the interest in the subject died out, which it did a few years ago, we considered it a sign that for a season, at any rate, our work was done.

interest in the interpretation of the New Testament, but it had not yet extended far beyond the circle of professed scholars. Within the circle there was soon shown a strong and natural desire to give a useful turn to the newly acquired knowledge, and to put at the disposal of the general reader the results of recent exegetical experience; and such general aid was commonly very thankfully received. But there was never much sympathy with these efforts whenever they took the particular form of revisions of the Authorized Version. Churchmen at that time were very tolerant of critical and grammatical comments, and even of corrections of the English Bible as long as they were confined to the notes or the margin; but whenever they took their place in the text there were but few general readers who then viewed them with any great amount of favor. And they were right. The versions and specimens of versions that appeared at the time we are alluding to, and subsequently, were sufficiently accurate and precise, but they wanted tone and rhythm. They were translations through which the original Greek often showed itself far too distinctly; they were not idiomatic versions; they were suited, and even in some cases specially designed, for the *closet*;* but with general readers they never were and never could have been popular.

The Five Clergymen revision.

The best of these revised versions was one that received at the time the valuable approval of Archbishop Trench,† and of the distinguished American

* Reference may, perhaps not improperly, be made to the writer's *Pref. to Commentary to the Pastoral Epp.*, p. xiii. seq., the words of which have been quoted from time to time. They were written about the period now alluded to, and show, it is believed, fairly, what the general mind of scholars was at that time. Of the small bands of scholars there referred to, one at the time was actually working, to the labors of which reference is made in the text.

† The friendly remarks of Archbishop Trench will be found in the first chapter of his useful work *On the Authorized Version of the New Testament*, and are as follows: "It is an eminent merit in the *Revision of the Authorized Version by Five Clergymen* . . . . . that they have not merely urged by precept, but shown by proof, that it is possible to revise our version, and at the

writer, Mr. Marsh,* and which even now has not quite passed out of sight. As it was produced on principles which appear to be trustworthy, and as it serves to indicate the path that must be followed by any revisers who would construct a *popular version*, we may pause briefly to notice its leading characteristics. It consisted of a revision of the Authorized Version of St. John's Gospel, the Epistle to the Romans, and the two Epistles to the Corinthians, by *Five Clergymen*, and of the Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, by *Four Clergymen;* in all, four separate volumes, to each of which a few pages of preface are prefixed, containing a statement of the principles mainly followed, and an enumeration of passages in which special difficulties had been met with, and rules of revision more than usually tested. Of the five revisers, two at the outset of the work were strongly in favor of an authoritative revision of the whole Testament, but ere the work came to its conclusion (it extended over more than two years), all, I believe, had come honestly and impartially to these two conclusions: First, that an authoritative revision could not wisely be attempted at that time; secondly, that if it afterward were undertaken, it must be on the principles which they themselves had worked out and

same time to preserve unimpaired the character of the English in which it is composed. Nor is it only on this account that we may accept this work as by far the most hopeful contribution which we have yet had to the solution of a great and difficult problem, but also as showing that where reverent hands touch that building, which some would have wholly pulled down, that it might be wholly built up again, these find only the need of here and there replacing a stone which had been incautiously built in the wall, or which, trustworthy material once, has now yielded to the lapse and injury of time, while they leave the building itself, in its main features and frame-work, untouched" (p. 25, ed. 1). These words, from one who is so well qualified to speak both on the English and on the scholarly questions connected with the subject, may perhaps be considered to justify the reference in the text to the experiences derived during the progress of the work alluded to.

* The author referred to, although deprecating a new translation, and even a revision, of the Authorized Version, speaks of the work of the Five Clergymen as "by far the most judicious modern recension known to him." See his first Series of *Lectures on the English Language*, No. xxviii., p. 633.

followed, and which more than two years of hard *united* work had proved to be trustworthy.

Principles of this revision.

These principles will be occasionally alluded to in detail in the following pages. For the present it may be enough to notice that they were, first, a limitation of the vocabulary of translation to that of the Authorized Version of both Testaments;* secondly, a careful attention, and, as far as possible, adherence to the principles stated and followed by the revisers of 1611; thirdly, extreme watchfulness in reference to the two weaker portions of the Authorized Version, the translation of the particles and of the tenses;† fourthly, and combined with this, a constant recognition in such cases of the frequently modifying power of the context, and of the fact that the tenses, especially the past tenses, in Greek and English, are not co-extensive; fifthly, a sensitiveness to the noble rhythm and cadence of the Authorized Version; and, lastly, a continual remembrance that a truly popular translation must always stand the test *of being heard as well as read*, and must commend itself not only to the cultivated scholar, but to the simple hearer.

Such were the principles of this particular revision,‡ and

* The Five Revisers distinctly state that they kept the earlier English versions, from Wicliffe downward, before them, and "constantly rejected words which presented themselves as the most exact equivalents to the words of the Greek because they wanted the Biblical garb and sound which we were anxious to preserve." See *Preface to Revised Version of St. John*, p. viii.

† The principles adopted in the translation of some of the particles are stated in the *Preface* above referred to (see p. x.). In respect of the tenses, it is stated that the "exact accuracy of literal rendering which rigid scholarship might seem to require" is not always maintained (p. xi.). It may be now said, however, that this accuracy was maintained even too far, especially in the case of the aorist and perfect. Such, at least, is the judgment of Marsh, who seems inclined to draw the inference from it that the tenses "are coming to have in England a force which they have not now in America." See *Lectures on the English Language*, No. xxviii., p. 633. Several changes, however, were made in the second edition.

‡ A full account will be found in the Preface to the *Revised Translation of St. John*. It is not violating confidence to say that it was principally the composition of the agreeable pen of the present Bishop of Salisbury, and that it will be found to contain a good account of the principles followed, and certainly deserves perusal.

such, it may be said, must be the principles of any revision that would aspire to be popular and successful. But let it not be supposed that these principles were all recognized at once, and all systematically acted on from the first. They were not thought out, but felt out and worked out. They resulted from faithful individual labor combined with *frequent conference and united efforts round a common table;* they resulted also from the great teaching of experience, and from the continual testing, and, it may be added, the frequent breaking down of rigorous canons of translation on which it might have seemed *à priori* that reliance could be placed. There are, indeed, few canons in reference to revision of more practical importance than those which are embodied in the foregoing sentence, viz., (1.) *That there must be frequent conference and the combined action of several minds*, and (2.) *That experience must be relied on as the only ultimately successful teacher in the difficult work.* Few are willing at first to accept these canons, but all scholars of candid minds and of proper humility will be found in the sequel to acknowledge their validity. As they are of real importance, let us devote to each of them a few sentences of comment and elucidation.

1st Canon: Several minds necessary.

In reference to the first of these canons, we may observe that it serves to remind us how it is that so very few revisions of the Authorized Version have been even endurable, when contrasted with that which they were designed to amend. Nearly all our revised versions have been produced by *individual* scholars, and, faithful to their origin, they have clearly enough disclosed the bias and individuality of the single mind and the single reviser. They have been one-sided and not many-sided. They have commonly been, if accurate, too inflexible; if free, too loose and paraphrastic. The happy elasticity of diction, and the thoroughly idiomatic tone of our English version—that which, in fact, so commends it to the heart as well as the head of the earnest reader, is just that which will be found wanting in all recent revisions. And it would be un-

reasonable to expect that it could be otherwise. The elasticity to which we have alluded is due in a great measure to the *united operation of several minds*, and to the continued modifications which the aspects of a passage as presented to the different minds of different revisers would be certain to introduce. The individual adheres, often far too pertinaciously in detail, to his principles of translation. His very precision often makes him very insufficiently sensitive to the exegetical current of the passage, and hence often to that modification which the context constantly tends to introduce in the translation, especially of tenses and particles. The requisite correction is supplied by another mind estimating differently the general current of the passage, and the ultimately chosen translation often accurately enough indicates, not so much the result of compromise, as the final decision of two or more minds after having so acted and reacted upon each other that a common translation could be agreed upon. For instance, an individual translator or reviser might feel it always, so to speak, such a grammatical duty to mark in translation the difference (in the same author) between two particles—let us say ἀλλά and δέ, that his very desire to adhere scrupulously to his rule might impede his perception of some shade of meaning in the passage that tended to modify the rule. Suppose, to carry on this particular instance, that he resolved that he would give ἀλλά in translation its inherently stronger adversative force of "howbeit" or "notwithstanding," and so mark its distinction from the "but" or "yet" of the lighter opposition of the δέ, and suppose further that he was a thoroughly good scholar, and perfectly familiar with the fact that if a definitely expressed negative preceded the ἀλλά in the contrasted clause, then his rule would have to undergo modification.* Suppose all this—and it will not

* For some remarks on this principle, which is, in fact, strictly analogous to the *nicht—sondern* of the German, see Donaldson, *New Cratylus*, § 201, p. 376. In some passages of the New Testament this principle is of very great importance. For example, in the momentous passage, Phil. ii., 6, οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, much in regard of

be difficult to imagine that there might be many a passage in which there might be found a latent negative, and so a modifying element in the context, which our imaginary accurate scholar with his mind on his rule might not be sensitive enough to perceive. Put other minds in contact with his; the result might easily be that discussion would bring out the true logical and exegetical aspects of the passage, that the latent negative in the preceding clause would be properly recognized, and the translation of the ἀλλά modified accordingly. Such examples of the importance of having several minds in combination in such a delicate work as that of revising our idiomatic Authorized Version could be multiplied indefinitely.

2d Canon: Experience the best guide.

The second canon, that experience will prove the best teacher in such a work as revision, though not quite so obvious as the canon which we have just illustrated, will in practice be found quite as certainly true. It might be thought that competent translators and revisers might agree on their principles beforehand, and go regularly forward without much risk of lapsing from uniformity, or of so changing a standard that it would be continually necessary to go over the back-work with the light of present knowledge and observation. It certainly *might* be thought so, but experience will always be found to reverse the expectation. General rules of course there must be, but in the application of them the tentative element must greatly predominate. The individual will find it so, and still more the combined body. In fact, this is the sort of set-off against the advantage of the co-operation of several minds specified above—the tendency of an association to change

translation turns upon the due recognition of the fact that we have two strictly contrasted clauses, as indicated by parity of tenses (ἡγήσατο—ἐκένωσεν) and by the presence of this οὐκ—ἀλλά. The translation, then, of the Authorized Version, enhanced as it is by the punctuation ("thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation") as failing to preserve and bring out this contrast of clauses, may fairly be considered as open to question. · See *Commentary in loc.*

gradually a standard being always much more pronounced than that of the individual.

A moment's consideration will show the truth of this remark, at any rate in such a special work as that of revision. What, for instance, is the very condition of revision? Why, that errors, and perhaps also inaccuracies and archaisms should be removed. Good; but, then, to take even the most favorable case, the removal of simple and clear errors, is it not perfectly certain that even if the definition of what was to be considered an error was tolerably agreed on at first, it would be considerably modified as the work went on, so that, if there was to be any thing like a uniform principle in the work, constant retrospect and reconsideration would be necessary? We venture very confidently to maintain that if half a dozen scholars sat down to revise the present version of one of the Gospels, and agreed beforehand, after having settled the distinction between errors and inaccuracies, only to touch the former and not the latter, it would be found, before they had gone half through their work, that they had taken in the whole fringe of cases that lies between errors and inaccuracies, and had even gone far into the domain of the latter. In revision, as in many other things, there is a continually accelerative and intensifying tendency which increased habitude in the work never fails to develop, but which certainly must be closely watched and constantly corrected. The best, and, indeed, the only way to keep this tendency under is to proceed tentatively, to *feel* out principles of revision rather than to attempt definitely to lay them down beforehand, and then, from time to time, as the principles are felt out, to go back over the work already done. It is only thus, it is only by this tentative and retrospective mode of proceeding, this continual reference to experience, that the subtle and delicate process of revision can be successfully carried out.

We gave an illustration of the first canon; we may perhaps, not unsuitably, give one of the second. Suppose it

was agreed beforehand that great care should be given, to distinguish, where possible, between the tenses—say, for example, between the aorist and the perfect. Now it may be confidently asserted that nothing but experience will adequately prescribe in cases of this kind when the "have" should be introduced in the translation of the aorist and when the simple past tense should be adopted. Whatever our rules might have been beforehand, they would break down in such a chapter, for example, as John xvii., and they would be sorely tested in those many cases in which, in the original Greek, particles of present time are found in the same clauses, and in combination with aorists.* And what is true of the aorist is almost equally true of the perfect. We might, for instance, begin our work by the general agreement that, whatever might be the case of the aorist, we would, at any rate, press the translation of the perfect, and recognize its force, and yet, when we came to such a passage as 1 John i., 1, we should not be perfectly clear that the lines of demarkation between aorist and perfect were always very rigidly drawn. We should have in the sequel to fall back on experience.

Illustration of the Canon.

But to return to the present aspects of this question.

From what has been said, it does not seem unreasonable to think that there has been during the last twelve years a gradual ripening of general interest in the subject of revision. We have all had time to think well over the former movement, to come to unbiased opinions

Growth of interest in the subject.

* For example, Phil. iii., 12, *ἤδη ἔλαβον*, and again ch. iv., 10, *ἤδη ποτὲ ἀνεθάλετε*, or in the case of *νῦν*, Eph. iii., 5, *ὡς νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη*—in all which cases it would be simply impossible to leave out the auxiliary in English and to adopt a simple aoristic translation. The actual fact is, that there is *not* a strict parity between the English past tense and the Greek aorist: the former points back clearly to past time and commonly taken *per se*; remands the thought back to an epoch distinctly separated from present time; the Greek aorist specifies posteriority to some fixed point of time, but is simply silent as to the fact whether the action has or has not any reference to present time. See esp. Donaldson, *New Cratylus*, § 372 seq., and the useful treatise on the force of this tense by Fritz, *De Aoristi Vi*, p. 17.

upon the principles which seem likely to prove most trustworthy in the actual prosecution of the work, and—what is especially important—to arrive at some conclusions as to the limits within which revision should be confined. We are also, in several respects, better prepared for the work. Though it must be conceded that New-Testament interpretation has not, at any rate in the Church of England, made much progress during the last ten years; though in some of the many schools of thought within the Church at the present time there is a retrograde movement, and a relapse to the easy labors of mystical commentaries and of loose exegesis; though our religious newspapers often give us evidence, in the letters of correspondents, that there is not only great, but, what is worse, confident ignorance on critical or grammatical questions; though much valuable time has been wasted on ritualistic controversy instead of being devoted to serene scholarship; though the study of the ancient versions has been almost absolutely stopped for the last twelve or fourteen years, still, in spite of all these discouraging facts, the assertion may be fully sustained that we are better prepared for the work than we were at the close of the last movement.

Two or three reasons may be alleged for such an opinion.

Reasons for this opinion.

In the first place, the majority of those who are most likely to be called upon to take part in any future revision will have matured in judgment, and have had time to reconsider the principles on which the former attempts had been based, in some of which they themselves may have taken part. Such scholars, who for the most part belonged to a somewhat sharply defined critical and exegetical school, will now find themselves recruited by some members of the more distinctly historical school of commentators and interpreters which has appeared during the last ten years. The keen, and perhaps, for a popular revision, unduly rigorous scholarship of those who were connected with the first movement will be now found beneficially influenced both by the wider knowledge and experience time will have brought

with it, and by the flexibility of the later systems of interpretations which have appeared either at home or in Germany. The delay will not have been unprofitable.

Increase of learning among Nonconformists.

In the second place, some worthy representatives of sound Biblical scholarship will be now found among the Nonconformists. The half-generation that has now elapsed since revision was last under consideration has witnessed the gradual rise and progress of sacred exegesis in all the higher training colleges of Wesleyans, Baptists, Independents, and other communities. Scotland also, in the person of Professor Eadie, Dr. Brown, and others, has shown that Presbyterians have not been left behind in the general advance.* And this is a matter of the utmost importance. It would not be hopeful to undertake such a truly national work as the revision of the English Bible, that Book of Life which is alike dear and common to us all, without the presence and co-operation of the most learned of our brethren of nonconformity.† This was properly felt and expressed by most of the speakers in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, and, we believe, would be frankly responded to by those we have alluded to. General questions may often keep us apart; uncharitable and embittered politicians

* It is pleasant to observe the steady progress that has been silently made in Biblical learning during the last twenty years by Nonconformists. The honored name of Tregelles—one who has given the whole energies of a life (alas! now seriously impaired) to sacred criticism—will at once supply an example of great and successful labors outside of the communion of the Church of England. We may also, perhaps, be permitted to specify the names of Dr. Gotch, of Bristol; of Dr. Angus, of the College in Regent's Park; and of the modest and singularly able translator of Winer's *Greek Grammar*, Professor Moulton, of Richmond—all men whose learning would entitle them to a place at any Board of Revision, and who would be welcomed there by all Biblical scholars of the Church of England.

† In his excellent treatise on Revision Archbishop Trench alludes to this subject. He does not, however, seem to contemplate the presence of Nonconformists at the actual revising Board, or as sitting there on equal terms with others; and he also somewhat summarily disposes of the claims of Baptists. See *Revision of Auth. Version*, ch. xi., p. 138. In the twelve years, however, that have elapsed since the work was written, my valued friend may very likely have modified his opinion. We all live and learn.

may continue, as we have seen not long since, their discreditable efforts to sow dissension and animosities, but in the calm region of Biblical learning such pitiful efforts will never be permitted to prevail. The men that may hereafter sit round the council-table of revision will be proof against all such uncharitableness;* they will be bound by the holy bond of reverence for the same Book, and adoration for the same Lord. Those whom God may hereafter vouchsafe to join together in a holy work, sectarian bitterness will never be able to put asunder.

Increase in our critical materials.

Thirdly, the additions that by the providence of God have been made to the critical material for the textual revision of the Authorized Version may well, on the one hand, make us thankful that this delay has taken place, and yet, on the other hand, make us desirous to show our thankfulness by now preparing to use what has been thus unexpectedly vouchsafed. Every earnest man *must* regard it as something more than accident that a manuscript such as the Sinaitic Manuscript, so venerable and so perfect, should have been discovered just at a time when such a witness was, in many important passages, so especially needed. Of an antiquity inferior only to the great Vatican Manuscript, in perfect preservation, and without a missing page, this venerable document is now in the hands of us all.† Surely it

* The following sentences from *The Freeman* for February 18 seem to justify this expectation. The writer justly observes that no existing version "could be endured in the place of the fine old English of our translators—we must have a restoration, not a rebuilding on a modern plan." He then adds: "It must also be a catholic translation. Learned men of all evangelical churches must be invited to co-operate, and the work fully and freely canvassed before it is fully accepted." The next sentence is specially worthy of attention: "One thing we had almost forgotten to remark — *the work must be done by the churches, not by the government.*" See also, as to Convocation, *The Times* for May 6.

† The general reader will find some useful remarks on this manuscript, and especially on its relation to the venerable Codex Vaticanus, in the *Christian Remembrancer* for October, 1867, vol. liv., p. 414 seq. There is also a special article on the imperial edition of this manuscript in the same periodical for April, 1863, vol. xlv., p. 374. For more exact and special information, the

asks for and requires from us our reverent consideration and use. Let it also not be forgotten that we have now at last trustworthy reprints of the Vatican Manuscript above alluded to;* and further, that individual scholars, through the labors of Mr. Hansell† and the enterprise of the Oxford University Press, can now themselves refer to, and, what is very important in finally forming a critical judgment, *read connectedly*, all the leading manuscripts of the different portions of the New Testament. With such aids now ready to our hand, we may be thankful indeed to have been delayed a few years, but we can also hardly resist the feeling that the hour is fast approaching when a practical and national use should be made of these great aids toward arriving at the *ipsissima verba* of apostles and evangelists, and of bringing to the ears of all who speak our language the truest accents of men who wrote and spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

Study of versions greatly neglected.

It may be conceded that there is one department of Biblical scholarship in which we are still very deficient, and one of such real importance that we might well plead for longer delay if there seemed any reasonable prospect of the deficiency being made up by scholars of the present time. We are alluding to the study of the ancient versions of the New Testament. If there seemed any grounds for thinking that these ancient witnesses would be more systematically consulted for exegetical as well as critical purposes, if there was any probability of translations being made in Latin, German, or English, of the Coptic, Armenian, or Pell

reader must be referred to the account of this MS. by Tregelles, and the elaborate *Prolegomena* of Tischendorf.

* A good article on this MS., and on the relation to it and to the Codex Bezæ of the Curetonian Syriac Version of part of the Gospels, will be found in the *Christian Remembrancer* for June, 1859, vol. xxxvii., p. 467.

† The title of this useful and valuable work is *Nov. Testam. Græce, Antiquissimorum Codicum*, ed. E. H. Hansell, Oxon., 1865. It does not contain the Codex Sinaiticus, having unfortunately been commenced before that manuscript was accessible. It contains, however, in the third volume, a very careful collation, and some useful critical notes.

Platt's Ethiopic Version, it would be wise to wait patiently till these had come into the hands of general scholars, and could be freely used, as they ought to be used, in such a work as the revision of our own version. But it is perfectly clear that if we waited for such aids, important as they confessedly are, we should wait in vain. There is no disposition in our own quick-moving times to engage in the *labor improbus* that such studies imply; there is no willingness on the part of younger scholars to devote themselves to what at first sight might be deemed only subsidiary and subordinate; and yet all experience shows that there is no more really valuable aid in the difficult work of deciding between conflicting interpretations than is supplied to us by the six or seven earlier versions.* In them we commonly have, not so much the opinion of the individual translation, as the prevailing voice of the ancient Church and people for the use of which the version was originally committed to writing. We have, perhaps, the combined judgment of many minds, and sometimes, in the case of the earliest versions, may have traditional interpretations which date almost from apostolic times. It is, at any rate, no stretch of imagination to suppose that portions of the Peshito might have been in the hands of St. John, or that the Old Latin represented the current views of the Roman Christians of the second century. Of these ancient witnesses, the two already named, the Gothic and the Polyglot Ethiopic Version (in the fairly accurate Latin translation of Bode) are tolerably available, but the best edition of the Coptic Version, the Ethiopic of Pell Platt, and the Armenian, are, we believe, up to the present time, inaccessible except to the student of these unfamiliar languages.

But to wait for accurate collations of these versions for

* The reader who may need a summary account of these ancient versions will find it in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, Art. "Versions." He may, perhaps, also be referred to the Preface to my *Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, and also *on the Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians*, for some comments from one who has attempted, as far as he was able, himself to use them.

exegetical purposes is to wait in vain. There is no greater likelihood now than there was half a generation ago that any further advance will be made in them than has been already made—nay, to begin the work of revision may prove the only hopeful way of directing attention to this portion of the subject. We have among us a few Coptic, Ethiopic, and Armenian scholars, and from them we may obtain aid when it becomes plain that it is really wanted. The demand may create the supply.

Division of the subject.

If this be so, if there seems really good ground for thinking that the time has at last come for, at any rate, the commencement of the work, and that longer delay is not likely to place us in any better position than what we now occupy, the present is clearly the time for some careful preliminary consideration, both in reference to the nature of the work and to the best mode of attempting it. Some little experience has been already acquired, and of this it seems prudent to make some use, if only by way of preparation and suggestion. Let us, then, deal in a simple and popular way with the general subject, and apply our attention to those leading questions which seem naturally to present themselves at this early stage of the work.

These questions would seem to come before us for consideration in the following order and connection: *First*, what is the critical state of the text of that portion of the Scriptures —the New Testament—that we are more particularly considering in these pages? *Secondly*, what is the general character of the Authorized Version of the New Testament, and what are the principles on which it was constructed? *Thirdly*, what are the limits to which, with due regard to these principles, revision should probably be confined? *Fourthly*, what is the probable amount of the corrections that would thus be introduced—a question of great practical importance, and on the answer to which much will be found hereafter to depend? *Fifthly*, what objections of real weight have been urged against revision? and, *Lastly*, if a revision is to be at-

tempted, in what way, and under what authority, would it seem best for us to proceed?

Such would seem to be the leading questions in connection with the subject of revision, to each one of which an answer shall be returned in the following pages. Our first considerations shall be on the text which, as far as it can be ascertained, was used by the scholars and divines who were engaged in the work of the last revision.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE CRITICAL VALUE OF THE TEXT OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION.

In discussing the interesting and practical question of the critical value of the text which was used by the revisers of 1611, we are naturally led into some cognate questions which it may be convenient to discuss in the present chapter. These shall now be stated, and shall receive such answers as may be serviceable to the general reader. In no part of the subject is technicality necessarily more prominent, but it shall be avoided as far as is consistent with accuracy of treatment. Attention shall be more directed to actual facts and results than to the details on which they depend.

Main questions to be considered.

The main questions which have now to be considered in connection with the text of the Authorized Version are, it would seem, *four* in number. *First*, it will be clearly necessary to ascertain what the Greek text actually *was* which was used by the revisers. Was it a text they constructed for themselves, or was it the text of any current edition, and if so, did they always adhere to it? *Secondly*, it will be necessary to take some account of the critical material which we now have, and of which the revisers had no knowledge. This will naturally lead us, in the *third* place, to consider the really practical question, How best to use this material in any future revision, whether to construct a critical text first, or to use preferentially, though not exclusively, some current text, or simply to proceed onward with the work of revision, whether of text or translation, making the current Textus Receptus the standard, and departing from it only when critical or grammatical considerations show that it is clearly necessary—in fact, *solvere am-*

*bulando.* *Lastly*, it will perhaps be convenient to endeavor to arrive at some estimate of the amount and the importance of the changes that critical considerations alone may be likely to introduce into the current text, there being on this subject much exaggeration on both sides. We may now proceed to consider these questions more in detail.

The text used by the revisers.

In reference to the first question—What the Greek text was which the revisers of 1611 actually had before them when they were engaged in their work—the answer can easily be made from inspection of the version. The revisers used two current editions, chiefly, as it would seem, Beza's fourth edition of the Greek Text, published in 1589, and the fourth edition of Stephens—the first of the editions of Stephens that was divided into verses—which was published in 1551. As both these editions were scarcely any thing more than reprints of the editions that respectively preceded, and as both these preceding editions had acquired considerable celebrity, we shall be quite correct in saying that the text of the Authorized Version is that of the third edition of Beza's Greek Testament of 1582 [Beza 3], and of Stephens's Greek Testament of 1550 [Stephens 3]. On a close examination of the comparatively few passages in which Beza 3 differs from Stephens 3, it would appear that in some 60 places (notes included) the Authorized Version agrees with Beza 3 against Stephens 3, and that in some 27 or 28 places (1 Cor. x., 38 being apparently an error of the press) it agrees with the latter against the former; and further, that in a very few passages, perhaps under half a dozen, it agrees with neither.

Pedigree of this text.

But we shall have hardly answered our first question satisfactorily unless we shortly enter into the further question of the pedigree and critical value of the Greek Text on which our own version thus depends. What was the history and critical value of Stephens 3 and Beza 3? Not perhaps very satisfactory in either case. The history, however, is as follows: Beza 3 and Stephens 3 really

differ so little that we may, writing popularly, consider them as one edition. Both editors had a certain amount of critical materials, the greater part of it in common, and collected by the son of Stephens. But neither of them made any real use of them. Beza, as we know, had in his possession the celebrated manuscript that bears his name (D of the Gospels and Acts*), and the nearly equally celebrated Claromontane Manuscript (D of the Epistles), but he seems to have mainly used both these and all his other critical aids more for exegetical purposes than any thing else. The estimate he took of various readings was, it would seem, almost entirely a theological one. Stephens also, though he began well, and based the text of his first edition on MSS. in the Royal Library at Paris and on readings from the first printed (though not first published) text, viz., the Complutensian, and though he also published in his third edition a collection of some 2200 various readings from 15 different MSS. (one of which was the Codex Bezæ), still in his third and most celebrated edition he made the least possible use of them, and even lapsed back again to the text of another editor that had been received with favor three-and-twenty years before. He frequently deserts the text of his own first and second editions to revert to that of the anterior editor.

The editions of Erasmus.

Who was this editor? It need hardly be said that it was Erasmus, and that *in the fourth edition of Erasmus we really have the mother-text of our own Authorized Version.* What then, finally, is the history of this Erasmian text, and what its critical value? Its history is short. In the year 1516, Erasmus, after not much more than six months' labor, published at Basle an edition of the Greek

* This venerable manuscript has recently been published with great care and accuracy by Mr. Scrivener. A very interesting account of the MS. is prefixed. For a thoroughly good review of this important work, see *Christian Remembrancer* for Dec., 1864, vol. xlviii., p. 416 seq. All the recent critical articles in this learned, but, we fear, now suspended Quarterly Journal, are especially good, and in most instances very readable. They appear to come mostly from the same hand.

Testament, and so got the start of the splendid Complutensian edition of Cardinal Ximenes,* the New Testament portion of which, though then printed, had not been published, and was not published till a few years afterward. Erasmus honestly says that his work was a "precipitated" one. It was so: he was not insensible to the value of ancient testimony, and, if he had allowed himself time, would probably have given a better text to the world than that which is connected with his name, but the excusable though unfortunate desire to anticipate the lingering volume of the Complutensian edition marred the great work, and the evil effects of that six months of hurry last to this very hour. It certainly is somewhat sad now to know that, though the MSS. which Erasmus used were collectively of no great critical value, yet that there was one good authority among them which he never used, for the very reason, as he himself tells us, that its readings were so different from the others. This manuscript was the cursive Codex Basiliensis, marked 1 in the usual lists of such documents, and fully deserving its accidentally given priority, being classed by Tregelles (with No. 33 and No. 69) as deserving a place in the noble group of ancient uncial witnesses which is headed by the Vatican and Sinaitic Manuscripts.†

It is vexatious also to think that, with a little effort, Erasmus might have procured, through his friend Paulus Bombasius, a transcript, or, at any rate, a collation of the famous

* Perhaps few of our readers may have actually inspected the exquisite specimen of early typography which the noble volumes of this edition present. We may mention, then, that a visit to the large library in the new house of the Bible Society will enable them to see a very fine copy of this justly celebrated edition. The beauty and clearness of the printing of the New Testament is most striking, and the tint of the ink is of that welcome gray-black tone which is now commonly found so agreeable to modern eyes.

† See the classification of Tregelles in his edition of the 4th vol. of Horne, *Introduction to the Scriptures*, p. 106. Some useful remarks on this classification will be found in a very careful and elaborate article on Textual Criticism in the *Christian Remembrancer* for July, 1864, vol. xlviii., p. 57 seq. See also the good article in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii., p. 506.

Vatican Manuscript (B) itself. He referred, we know, to it in regard of the famous text in the first Epistle of St. John, and had a transcript sent to him of a portion of the fifth chapter. How strange it seems that we were so near a good text, and yet that it pleased God (for such things are doubtless providentially ordered) that a sixteenth century manuscript of the ordinary late character of text should be the one chosen by Erasmus, and used by the printer (for his marks remain on it to this day) for the first *published* edition of the Book of Life. Such incidents are really mysterious. To speculate on them is unwise, but it does still seem hard to resist the conviction that the unflagging industry and devotion that has been conspicuously shown, generation after generation, in the critical study of the text of the New Testament, would never have been called forth but by these very circumstances; and that the knowledge that a purer text of the sacred Volume was attainable than that which, one hundred years afterward, was dignified by the title of the Universally Received Text, is really that which has quickened scholars and critics in their honorable and life-long labors even to our present day.

Succeeding editions of the foregoing.

But to return to our short narrative. This first edition of Erasmus was succeeded by a second, in which there were about 400 alterations, nearly three fourths of which were, in the judgment of Mill, decidedly improvements. This edition was followed by the famous third edition, in which 1 John v., 7 first appeared, and owing to which the controversial troubles of Erasmus, already sufficiently great owing to his Latin Version, were considerably increased. Soon afterward the Complutensian edition of the Greek Testament at length appeared to the world, and Erasmus was able to compare his own work with that of Stunica and Lebrixa, and to correct especially what most certainly needed correction, the text of the Revelation — the single manuscript which he used having here been imperfect, and, in the case of the concluding verses, actually so defective

that, as we know, Erasmus had here to produce a text by retranslation of the Vulgate *into his own Greek.* In this fourth edition, which appeared in 1527, he consequently introduced changes in the text of the Revelation in about 90 places, and corrected and removed, though not wholly, what he had himself supplied. In other portions of Scripture there were very few changes made. The third edition had differed in 118 places from the second, but the fourth differed only in about 16 from the third.

Such was the fourth edition of Erasmus, the mother-edition of the Textus Receptus and of our own Authorized Version. It was based, as we have seen, on scanty evidence and late manuscripts. It contains two interpolations which the editor himself introduced on his own responsibility, viz., Acts viii., 37, and words in Acts ix., 5, 6. It is especially unsatisfactory in the Revelation. Where in any degree dependent on a version, it is dependent only on a very bad and even deformed text of the Vulgate. Such it is; and yet, by the providence of God the Holy Ghost, and through the loyalty and reverence with which the Word of God had been transmitted, and that faithfulness which stirred in the hand and heart even of the writer of the meanest cursive manuscript, *it is what it is*—so far substantially in accordance with what now we may rightly deem to be the true text as justly to call forth our enduring thankfulness for this mercy and providence of Almighty God.*

* This general statement has been often exaggerated. It has been said from the days of Mill that the variations, though so very many in number, are wholly unimportant; and, on the other hand, especially of late years, it has been implied that the changes which textual criticism would introduce are even more important than those which would be introduced by scholarship and exegesis. See Westcott, *History of the English Bible*, p. 170. This last statement is perhaps too wide. The exact state of the case would seem to be that there *are* some important passages, especially of a historical character (*i. e.*, Mark xvi., 9 seq.; John v., 3, 5; vii., 53–viii., 11; Acts viii., 37), in which the present text must be considered either incorrect or doubtful, but that there are not many in which doctrine is directly involved. A useful paper on the various readings of the New Testament (by the Rev. R.

Present affluence of critical materials.

But while we may justly retain this thankful remembrance in our hearts, while we may thus rightly bless and adore God for the heritage of his truth which we have in our Authorized Version, let us not forget that the same God who thus vouchsafed his providential care to the transmission of his Word has also permitted us, in the 260 years that have passed away since that version was published, and especially of late years, to have acquired a very accurate knowledge of what were probably the very words, which were either traced by the hands of apostles and evangelists, or dictated by them to the faithful writer. This knowledge we now have; this knowledge it must be our bounden duty reverently and faithfully to make use of. No mere conservatism, no timid apprehension of unsettling a belief, already (God knoweth) so unsettled from other causes that textual criticism would rather act in a contrary direction—no acquiescence in well meant but really ignorant prejudice, must prevent us faithfully bringing out of the treasures vouchsafed to us every item that will aid in putting before us in their truest form what an apostolic father has not scrupled to call "the true sayings of the Holy Ghost." The only question will be, as we indicated at the beginning of this chapter, What have we now in our treasures that early editors had not? what are the materials now at our disposal for bringing the text of the Authorized Version more into conformity with what we believe to have been the original text?

Without entering, in a popular essay like the present, into detailed descriptions of MSS. or of the various critical materials that have accumulated in the last two centuries and a half, let us, at any rate, devote two or three pages to a consideration of the sources to which now we can appeal in any revision of a text.

Critical materials consist, on the one hand, of ancient uncial manuscripts, cursive manuscripts, ancient versions of

B. Girdlestone) will be found in the *Christian Advocate and Review* for October, 1869. It has since been republished.

the Scripture, quotations of Scripture from the best editions of earlier fathers; and, on the other hand, of all these technical facts and principles which the study of ancient documents has brought out, and which continued observation has confirmed.

Critical materials.

In respect of the first-named of these materials, the uncial manuscripts, how much have we to be thankful for, how much we owe to recent industry. Not to mention the five-and-twenty or six-and-twenty manuscripts, whole or fragmentary, of secondary importance, whether of the Gospels or of other portions of Scripture—though it should be said some of these claim places all but the highest—let us remember that we now have two manuscripts, the second of which contains the whole, and the first nearly the whole, of the New Testament, viz., the Vatican (B) and Sinaitic (ℵ), both of as early a date as the fourth century, and three following them at no distant intervals, the nearly complete Alexandrian Manuscript (A),* the fragmentary rescript at Paris bearing the name of the Codex Ephremi (C),† both probably of the fifth century, and for the Gospels and Acts only a remarkable manuscript that bears the title of the Codex Bezæ (D), and which can not be placed later than the middle of the sixth century. Besides these, we have, for the Acts of the Apostles, the valuable Laudian

Uncial manuscripts, and editions of them.

* The Codex Alexandrinus has been recently published in a convenient form by Mr. Cowper. An article on this manuscript will be found in the *Christian Remembrancer* for June, 1861, vol. xli., p. 367 seq.

† This manuscript, which bears its name from the fact that the original writing has been in great measure erased to allow of a work of Ephrem the Syrian being written on the same parchment, has been edited in a handsome volume by Tischendorf, to which a very valuable Introduction has been prefixed. No one who may not have seen manuscripts of this nature can imagine the patience required to trace the all but erased writing of the original text. The interesting Codex Zacynthius (see *Christian Remembrancer* for January, 1862, vol. xliii., p. 128 seq.), now in the library of the Bible Society, is a manuscript of this nature, which any one interested in the subject will do well to obtain a sight of, if only the better to appreciate the labor and skill of Tregelles, who deciphered it, we believe, without the use of any chemical reagent.

Manuscript (E), not later probably than the beginning of the sixth century; for St. Paul's Epistles, the first four manuscripts already specified, the valuable Claromontane (D Epp.), and the later but very important Augiensian Manuscript (F);* for the catholic epistles the same four, and a manuscript of the ninth century of fair critical value (containing also a portion of the Acts and the whole of St. Paul's Epistles), bearing the title Codex Angelicus (G); and even for the critically ill-supplied Apocalypse, the third and fourth of the great manuscripts first named (A and C), and a manuscript of a trustworthy character now in the Vatican Library (B Rev.), and of the eighth century.

Of these ten manuscripts the eight most important have been published, some in a portable and convenient form, as, for example, the Vatican, Sinaitic, Alexandrian, Beza's, and Augiensian, some in more expensive forms, but all in such a manner as to make it not only possible, but easy for the student to read and study the text of each *in its sequence and connection*, and so to form a more trustworthy judgment of the peculiar character of the individual document. This has been facilitated still further by the parallel-column volumes edited by Mr. Hansell, to which reference has already been made. By means of this useful work the student is now enabled not only to read continuously, but readily to compare all the really great manuscripts (except the Sinaitic), and thus to arrive at that sort of practical knowledge of these ancient witnesses which is ever found to be of the utmost value to the intelligent critic of the text of the New Testament. The simplicity and dignified conciseness of the Vatican Manuscript, the great expansiveness of our own Alexandrian Manuscript, the partially mixed characteristics of the Sinaitic, the paraphrastic tone of the singular Codex Bezæ—these

* This manuscript has been excellently edited by Mr. Scrivener, and a very complete account of it given in the Introduction prefixed to the work. Some useful remarks on the manuscript will be found in the *Christian Remembrancer* for June, 1859, vol. xxxvii., p. 500 seq.

general facts, all not only to be ascertained, but to be familiarly felt and instinctively acted on in the work of criticism, are now brought home to the student by the works above specified. We have thus, at the present time, not only in our public libraries documents of the greatest value of which our revisers had no knowledge, but, owing to the industry of recent critics and scholars, reprints and editions which make them available almost for the humblest student. When we pause to think of our present critical treasures, and the easy access that is thus afforded to them, and remember that of the great manuscripts above alluded to only one was in any degree used, and that in the most imperfect manner, by those on whom our revisers had to rely for their text, it would seem impossible to doubt that, even if we had no additional reasons, it is now an imperative duty on all faithful scholars to combine in making available to all, the results of a cautious and intelligent revision of the text of our English Testament.

Additional critical materials.

But we have many more critical subsidies than those already specified. Not to weary the general reader with details, we may shortly notice that by the labors of our own countrymen, Dr. Tregelles and Mr. Scrivener, and the industry of Dr. Tischendorf and other Continental critics, we have now arrived at a greatly improved knowledge of all the leading *cursive* manuscripts, and have learned to assign to them the confessedly subordinate but still important place they hold in reference to textual criticism. The true readings of the quotations of Scripture in the early fathers have also, by the really exhaustless labors of Dr. Tregelles, now been carefully examined and tested, and we hope, by the publication of the concluding parts of his Greek Testament, will be soon made critically available to all students of the sacred text. In one department only is there still some deficiency. We lack a full knowledge of the Ancient Versions. In our knowledge of the Latin Versions, whether the Old Latin or Vulgate, great advance has been made by the publications and collations of Tischendorf

and others. To the Syriac Versions a great and critically important addition has been made by the discovery and the publication of the singular, and sometimes rather wild, Curetonian Syriac Version.* Much has also been done in the Gothic Version by De Gabelentz and Loebe, Massmann, Bosworth, and others, and something in the Coptic by Paul de Lagarde, and in the Ethiopic by Pell Platt; but it must be frankly admitted that what has been already said in reference to exegesis (p. 26) is also partially true in reference to criticism. Our great critics have had avowedly to use the eyes of others in ascertaining the testimony of some of these last-mentioned versions, and of the less important but still interesting Armenian Version. It is not unfair to say that if Dr. Tischendorf had devoted only the time which he has unfortunately spent in personal controversy to the study of the original languages of those two or three ancient Oriental versions, which he confessedly only cites on the authority of others, he would have put all scholars and critics of the New Testament under still greater obligations to his unwearied industry, and himself have been still better qualified to labor for the inspired Volume for which he has done so much.

Critical knowledge proportionately increased.

But, besides these great accessions of critical material, it must not be forgotten that a fully commensurate increase in critical knowledge and in the power over materials is now distinctly to be recognized. Not only have we for the New Testament the completed work of three professed critical editors of a very high order, though of singularly different characteristics, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, but the useful and intelligent labors of several

* A good account of this version and its characteristics will be found in the *Christian Remembrancer* for June, 1859, vol. xxxvii., p. 488 seq. The text is of a very composite nature; sometimes it inclines to the shortness and simplicity of the Vatican Manuscript, but more commonly presents the same paraphrastic character of text as the Codex Bezæ. It has some interesting readings, *e. g.*, Matt. v., 4, 5, where it confirms the express statement of Origen that the blessing on the meek came before that on mourners. We do not, however, adopt the change.

interpreters and commentators, some of whom, like Dr. Meyer, have shown considerable acumen and aptitude for textual criticism. What is even more important, there may now be observed a fairly defined consent between these critics and commentators in numberless passages in the New Testament, where what would seem to be the true reading differs from that of the Revised Text. The useful little edition of the Greek Testament by Mr. Scrivener shows this very distinctly in the case of the professed critical editors, and a very cursory inspection of the comments of De Wette, Meyer, Alford, and others will substantiate the remark in the case of recent interpreters. Very many readings—perhaps nearly one half of those about which reasonable doubt may be felt—would thus, if considered by revisers of sufficient critical powers, be decided on at once by general consent. Manuscript evidence and critical judgment would be found clearly preponderant, and in a large portion of the work a text might be settled with very little difficulty.

This is a consideration which may well weigh with us when the differences of opinion as to the true text are assumed to be so excessive that revisers would be stopped *in limine* by the difficulty of ascertaining what the true words really were of which they had to revise the translation.

Undesirable to form a Textus Receptus.

But we are now naturally led to the third question, which we have already noticed as requiring some answer, What course would revisers have to follow? As we have said already, there are three possible courses they might take, which it may be well for us briefly to consider. Would it be well for them, in the first place, to agree on a critical Greek text, and attempt to construct a second Textus Receptus? To this question we venture to answer very unhesitatingly in the negative. Though we have much critical material and a fair amount of critical knowledge, we have certainly not yet acquired sufficient critical judgment for any body of revisers hopefully to undertake such a work as this. All such attempts, whether on the

part of individuals or general bodies, are indeed at present much to be deprecated as certainly premature, and as naturally tending to delay ultimate progress. We are steadily gravitating to a consent as regards a very considerable number of passages; let us not interfere with that natural process by trying to anticipate what we shall successfully arrive at if we have but patience and industry.* The failures of recent critical editors in their attempts to construct a text may well prove salutary warnings that we are not yet ready for the work, and that individual critics would do well to pause in their more ambitious efforts. As has been said, they really check progress; if only from this circumstance, that the critical editor often fails to give a true statement of the actual case. He probably, on very serious deliberation, places a certain reading in his text, but perhaps neither by typography nor by marginal annotation indicates to the general reader that another reading has nearly an equal right to occupy the position of honor. Possession has thus given many a reading a *preferential* character to which it really has no exclusive claim. *It is in the text;* and between that position and one outside of it, the difference, in the judgment of the ordinary student, is naturally considered to be immense. Griesbach saw this clearly, and very properly acted on it; but it has been often otherwise with recent editors. They have only indicated their opinion by their text, and have not at the same time perceived that in assigning a place in the text to any debated word or clause, they really have thus been passing a judgment of a *much more final* character than they themselves would, in many cases, wish it to be consid-

* Some very good and sagacious remarks on the undesirableness of attempting at present to construct an authoritative text will be found in the *Christian Remembrancer* for June, 1859, vol. xxxvii., p. 503. See also vol. xlii., p. 114, and vol. xlviii., p. 59. Whatever individual scholars may do, it is to be hoped that no commission would consider the formation of a text a preliminary duty to that of revision of the translation. The latter will gradually pave the way for the former; but the process, we venture to think very decidedly, could not wisely be inverted. We must wait for a Received Text.

ered. Let us, then, have no Textus Receptus, at any rate at present, but proceed, as good sense seems to indicate, tentatively, and be content to wait. Perhaps in a very few years the remaining number of passages about which there is still considerable doubt will, by the very tentative process of the work, be reduced almost indefinitely; but, be it also remembered, it will not be so reduced unless the work is attempted, unless further experience is acquired, and textual revision actually commenced.

No recent critical text to be taken.

In what has been already said we have expressed indirectly our opinion on the second possible course, viz., that of adopting the text of some known critic, and of departing from it only where there seemed strong reason. Such a course would be very undesirable. No text has yet appeared which could be safely adopted as the text of a new revision. Would it be possible, for instance, to take the text of Lachmann? Would it be reasonable to base our work on a text composed on the narrowest and most exclusive principles, though constructed with fair adherence to those principles? Assuming that Lachmann has by his work substantiated his intention of giving to the world the text that was apparently current in the fourth century, would Lachmann himself, if appealed to, have judged his own text a suitable text to form the basis of a popular revised version? Self-sufficient as he was, he was certainly a man of correct judgment and instinctive scholarship, and would have been the first to point out that a text which, on the most favorable assumption, was only the text of a certain century, was not the most convenient to bend into the direction which a hitherto current and received text would often oblige a mediating critic to take. Lachmann's text is really one based on little more than four manuscripts, and so is really more of a critical recension than a critical text.

The case of Tischendorf is still more easily disposed of, as the question would at once arise, Which of this most inconstant critic's texts are we to select? Surely not the last, in

which an exaggerated preference for a single manuscript, which he has had the good fortune to discover, has betrayed him into an almost child-like infirmity of critical judgment.* Surely also not the seventh edition, which was issued before the appearance of the Sinaitic Manuscript, and which exhibits all the instability which a comparatively recent recognition of the authority of cursive manuscripts might be supposed likely to introduce. If any edition of this restless critic's Greek Testament had to be selected, perhaps we should feel it best to go back to the third; but such a use of a now forgotten volume is never likely to be made when we have in our own country, and, it is to be hoped, soon in a complete state, such a far better text as that of Dr. Tregelles.

And yet, though it seems hard to say so after the life-long labors of its estimable constructor, even this text could not wisely be chosen as the text to be used in the work of revision. In the first place, in the earlier parts of his work, Dr. Tregelles had not the advantage of the Sinaitic Manuscript. In the second place, his critical principles, especially his general principle of estimating and regarding modern manuscripts, are now, perhaps justly, called in question by many competent scholars. Thirdly, though his materials have been so much more abundant, he approximates, at any rate in some parts of his great work, so closely to the same results as Lachmann, that any objections which may exist to the choice of Lachmann's as a standard text apply with nearly equal force

* An able writer in the *Christian Remembrancer* for April, 1866, has carefully analyzed the amount of fluctuation which is to be observed in Tischendorf's latest critical decisions as compared with those in earlier editions. From this analysis it would seem that between his Greek Testament of 1849 and that of 1859, or his 3d and so-called 7th editions, there are 1296 variations; and that in nearly half of these he returns, in the later edition, to the Textus Receptus. When, however, we examine his recent and last edition, it appears that, to go no farther than the first thirty-two chapters, he reverses his judgment of 1859 in as many as 168 places, and again falls back on his earlier opinion of 1849. This great inconstancy is to be attributed to a natural want of sobriety of critical judgment and to an unreasonable deference to the readings as found in his own Codex Sinaiticus.

to that of Tregelles. Lastly, though it seems an ungracious criticism, yet it must, in all frankness, be said that the text of Tregelles is not in all respects satisfactory. It is rigid and mechanical, and sometimes fails to disclose that critical instinct and peculiar scholarly sagacity which is so much needed in the great and responsible work of constructing a critical text of the Greek Testament. The edition of Tregelles will last, perhaps, to the very end of time as a noble monument of faithful, enduring, and accurate labor in the cause of Truth; it will always be referred to as an uniquely trustworthy collection of assorted critical materials of the greatest value, and, as such, it will probably never be superseded; but the text which is based on these materials is not likely ever to be a popular or current text, or ever to be used otherwise than as a faithful summary of critical principles which have by no means met with general acceptance.

Received Text to be used, but to be revised.

We seem driven, then, to the third alternative in reference to a text—*solvere ambulando*, or, in other words, to leave the Received Text as the standard, but to depart from it in every case where critical evidence and *the consent of the best editors* point out the necessity of the change. Such a text would not be, nor deserve to be, esteemed a strictly critical text: it would be often too conservative; it would also be occasionally inconsistent; but, if thus formed by a body of competent scholars, it would be a critical revision of a very high, and, probably, very popular character. It would, at any rate, be free from one great disturbing element in all critical labors, individual bias and personal predilections.

Such a work would not be by any means difficult. In the first place, it *has been* attempted by five scholars working in combination, and found by experience not in any degree to be unmanageable or unsatisfactory in its results. In the next place, those engaged in the work would have, not merely the actual external critical evidence whereon to rely for the correction of the text on which they were working, but,

as has been already hinted, they would also have the judgment, very frequently unanimous, first, of professed critics, and, secondly, of intelligent interpreters, on which they might often feel disposed conscientiously to rely. They would have available not only the critical materials, but the practical judgments that had been passed on them in the texts of the best editors and commentators.

This is a consideration that deserves very carefully to be borne in mind by any who may be inclined to overestimate the difficulties which revisers would meet with in the matter of a text.

It need scarcely be added that such a mode of proceeding would have to be tentative. Principles would be slowly formed as the work went on, but at length they would become fixed and recognized, and all that would be found necessary would be to review all the earlier part of the work, during which the experience was being acquired, and to bring it up to the general standard. And the results would be found to be satisfactory. We are bold enough to say this, because trial has fairly shown that what is here specified and recommended is feasible and hopeful. Such, then, would seem to be the best mode of dealing with the confessedly difficult question which stands third in the questions of the present chapter.

Amount of change estimated.

The last question may now be shortly answered: On the assumption that such a mode of dealing with the text *was* adopted, what amount of change, due purely to textual revision, might be expected in our present Authorized Version? Such a question it certainly seems very desirable to attempt to answer, as there is evidently a very exaggerated idea now popularly entertained as to the amount of change that would be introduced by judicious textual criticism. But how shall the answer be made? Perhaps thus: By taking account of the changes of text that actually were proposed in one Gospel and three long Epistles in a revision already alluded to—the Revision by Five Cler-

gymen of the Authorized Version of St. John's Gospel and the first three of St. Paul's Epistles, as arranged in our ordinary Testaments, viz., Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians. The Gospel and these three Epistles amount to, estimated in verses, between one quarter and one third of the whole New Testament: an estimate, therefore, founded on the consideration of so large a portion of the sacred Volume will not be very seriously incorrect.

By inspection of the Revision referred to, we find that in the 2006 verses which the Gospel and three Epistles together contain, there are 253 changes of text due to critical considerations, being 48 for the 879 verses of the Gospel of St. John, 56 for the 433 verses of the Epistle to the Romans, 91 for the 437 verses of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and 58 for the 257 verses of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. In this enumeration we observe that there would seem to be an increase in change as the work went on; but it would seem ultimately to have become stationary, and to have finally amounted to about one change in every five verses in St. Paul's Epistles. And that this seems accurate may be proved by an inspection of the changes in the Revision of the four succeeding Epistles, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians — in all 496 verses. Here we find 109 textual changes, or very nearly the same proportion. If, then, we assume that more changes would have been made in St. John's Gospel if the gradually established standard of revision had been applied to it, though, as the nature of the text reminds us, not to the extent arrived at for St. Paul's Epistles —and if also we take into account the increase of differences over those in St. John's Gospel that would be probably found in the Synoptical Gospels, and in the Acts and Revelation, we should hardly be far wrong in estimating the amount of changes that would be introduced in any English revised version of the whole 6944 verses of the New Testament as not exceeding one for every five verses, or under fourteen hundred in all, very many of these being of a wholly unimportant character.

Such seems the answer to the last question we have suggested in the present chapter. The subject of the text and of probable textual change seems now concluded, and the second portion of our work to begin, viz., a consideration of, and finally a rough estimate of the changes that would have to be introduced on grammatical, exegetical, and possibly also some other grounds which may suggest themselves in the review of the whole subject.

This second class of changes can only be introduced with strict and persistent reference to the general aspect and characteristics of the last revision. We proceed, then, next to consider these characteristics, and the principles on which the Authorized Version of the New Testament appears to have been constructed.

## CHAPTER III.

### LEADING CHARACTERISTICS OF THE AUTHORIZED VERSION.

Character of our version must be preserved.

It is obvious that no revision of the present version can properly be undertaken that does not preserve the wisely-drawn lines on which that version was constructed. No reasonable Englishman would tolerate a version designed for popular use, and to be read publicly, that departed from the ground-principles and truly noble diction of the last revision. Such a version would simply pass into that limbus of "improved" and happily forgotten translations to which almost every generation, for the last hundred and fifty or two hundred years, has added some specimen. The present century has been more prolific than those which preceded it, but very few of the yet extant revisions have been happy in preserving the character, tone, rhythm, and diction of the version they have undertaken to amend. It may be wise then, at the very outset, to endeavor to obtain a clear knowledge of the principal features and general characteristics of our present version, that so, before revision is undertaken, we may be able to define sharply what must be its nature and limits, if it is to be a revision that is in any degree to meet with general acceptance.

If it is to be hereafter a popular version it can only become so by exhibiting, in every change that may be introduced, a sensitive regard for the diction and tone of the present version, and also by evincing, in the nature and extent of the changes, a due recognition of the whole internal history of the English New Testament. In other words, the new work must be on the old lines.

And now what were those lines, and how may we best trace them? Perhaps thus: first, by briefly considering what

may be termed the pedigree of the present English Version; and, secondly, by shortly noticing the principles which in the last revision appear mainly to have been followed.

Pedigree of our present version.

The literary pedigree of our present version has perhaps never been more succinctly, and, for the most part, accurately stated than in the following words: "Our present English version was based upon the Bishops' Bible of 1568, and that upon Cranmer's of 1539, which was a new edition of Matthew's Bible of 1537, partly from Coverdale of 1535, but *chiefly* from Tyndale; in other words, our present authorized translation is *mainly* that of Tyndale made from the original Hebrew and Greek."* A little expansion and illustration of this sentence will enable the general reader fairly to appreciate the internal character of our present version.

The first fact clearly to be borne in mind is this, that, after all changes and revisions, our present English Testament is substantially that of William Tyndale.† This we shall deem it necessary to prove distinctly by a comparison in parallel columns of three or four passages, taken from different parts of the New Testament. Before, however, we give these specimens, let us briefly notice the characteristics of this version, to which our own maintains so close a resemblance.

Tyndale's Version: made from the Greek.

Tyndale's English Testament of 1534 will remain to the end of time a monument of the courage, patience, learning, competent scholarship, thorough faith-

* This accurate and inclusive sentence is taken from the Preface to the scholarly work of Bosworth and Waring, entitled *Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels*, Lond., 1865. See pages xxviii., xxix. The word "mainly" has been italicized for the reasons that will appear later in this chapter. The relation of the A.V. to Tyndale's is very close.

† It has been observed by Mr. Westcott that in several portions of the New Testament Tyndale's original translation remains almost intact. For instance, in the 1st Epistle of St. John about nine tenths are due to Tyndale, and even in the more difficult and (as to translation) debatable Epistle to the Hebrews about five sixths belong to the same faithful hand. See *History of English Bible*, p. 211, note. An interesting and appreciative estimate of the character of this good man's great work will be found in the current number of the *Quarterly Review*, vol. cxxviii., p. 316. See above, p. 16, note †.

fulness, and clear English sense of its noble-hearted and devoted editor. Of his courage and patience history sufficiently speaks: in reference to his learning and scholarship, with which we are here more especially concerned, a few remarks may not unsuitably be made. That his learning was sufficient for his work is shown by the work itself. Besides this, however, we know that more than twenty years before his first edition of 1525 he made translations of portions of the New Testament, and Tyndale was not a man to let those twenty years pass away without study and fresh acquisitions of knowledge. We know also that he went to Cambridge, after having spent some years at Oxford, most probably with the view of studying under Erasmus, who himself might have been contemplating the great though hurried work which he did a very few years later. We further know that he actually produced evidence to Tonstall of his having competent knowledge of the Greek language, and Tonstall was certainly not a man to whom an incompetent Greek scholar would have been very likely to have submitted any specimen of his powers. Whatever may be said of Tyndale's knowledge of Hebrew prior to his publication of the New Testament, it seems perfectly clear, even from these external considerations, that he had a thoroughly competent knowledge of Greek, and, further, that he had been studiously preparing himself for his responsible work. Really, with his work in our hands, it would almost seem superfluous to have adduced any other evidence; but, as very unguarded statements have been made in reference to Tyndale's Testament, even by an authority as great as Mr. Hallam,* and as the students of

* See *Literature of Europe*, chap. vi., § 37, vol. i., p. 526, where we meet with the thoroughly mistaken assertion that from Luther's translation, "and from the Latin Vulgate, the English translation of Tyndale and Coverdale is avowedly taken." That he was indebted to some extent to Luther for his prologues and notes in the edition of 1534 may be perhaps fairly admitted, but that his translation was taken from that of Luther may most confidently be denied. For a full account of Tyndale's labors, see the excellent *Historical Account of the English Versions* prefixed to Bagster's *Hexapla*, p. 40 seq.,

Tyndale's Testament are but few, it may be desirable at the very outset to correct the erroneous impression that we owe the real original of our present version to German translations and second-rate learning. It is quite reasonable to believe that, especially in the corrections he introduced in his edition of 1534, and in the substance of some of his terse notes, he may have owed something to the learning and labors of foreign reformers; but it is also certain that his version is essentially of English origin, and that the earnest and devoted man to whom we owe it was fully equal to carry through singlehanded the great work which he had undertaken.

In addition to this, it does not seem too much to say that Tyndale's knowledge and scholarship, as far as we can infer from the times and the circumstances of the times in which he lived, was exactly of the kind, if one man was to do the work, best suited for such an undertaking. Had he been more of a professed scholar there would have been some traces of pedantic accuracy, some indications of adherence to the general tone of the Vulgate on the one hand, or to the more cultivated language of the day on the other, not any of which are to be recognized in the noble homeliness of the version of William Tyndale. As it was providentially ordered, he was the patient, devoted Englishman, competently learned, who made it his care to write for English eyes and English hearts, and did so with faithfulness, geniality, and breadth.

The first fact and characteristic, then, of Tyndale's Version is that it was fairly made from the Greek, and that Tyndale had certainly sufficient learning to do well this portion of the great work of his life.

and compare Westcott, *History of English Bible*, p. 174 seq. Fuller's summary is characteristically short and quaint: "However, what he [Tyndale] undertook was to be admired as glorious; what he performed, to be commended as profitable; wherein he failed is to be excused as pardonable, and to be scored on the account rather of that age than of the author himself." See *Church History*, book v., 4, 39, p. 224 (Lond., 1655).

Independent of the then extant versions.

The second characteristic of his version is one which may at first surprise us, but for which we may be heartily thankful, viz., that, as he himself tells us, he made no use of the then extant versions of the Scripture. The most popular version would no doubt then have been the easy and smoothed edition of Wicliffe's original version commonly associated with the thoroughly honorable name of Wicliffe's curate at Lutterworth, John Purvey.* That neither this nor any of the Wicliffite versions were made the basis of Tyndale's work is certainly a subject for profound thankfulness. With every desire to honor the name and labors of Wicliffe, and with a full recognition of his general accuracy as a translator, and even a critic, we can not forget, first, that his version was from the Vulgate, and was thus a version of a version; secondly, that it adheres, where possible, to the form and structure of the Latin, the intention of the version being, most probably, not only to benefit the mere English reader, but to aid the student of the Vulgate; thirdly, that, though generally very homely in its language, it still has many more words of Latin origin than we should have expected from Wicliffe's avowed desire to give an English Testament to English readers. It must then be regarded as providential that such a version did not form the basis of our present Bible. Had it been so ordered, the English Bible of our day would have become ultimately a sort of Rhemish Version, rigid, cold, and Latinized.†

* For an account of this reviser and of his labors, see the Preface to Forshall and Madden, *Wicliffite Versions*, p. xxviii. seq. Purvey did his work with care and judgment, and had conceptions of the duties of a translator of the Scriptures considerably in advance of the times in which he lived. See also *Historical Account* (Bagster's *Hexapla*), p. 28 seq., and Westcott, *History of English Bible*, p. 16.

† It is singular that a writer so well informed as Marsh (*Lectures on the English Language*) should regard Tyndale's Version as little more than a recension of Wicliffe's, and "Tyndale as merely a full-grown Wicliffe" (p. 627). It is, of course, not only possible, but probable, that Tyndale was acquainted with Wicliffe's, or, more probably, Purvey's Version, but that he used it in any way in making his own translation may most justly be doubted. Tyn-

It is equally providential that the Wicliffite Version that is attributed to Purvey, and which ultimately superseded the earlier version, did not become either the basis or model for our own version; for, though Purvey's prologue to his work is most interesting,* and some of his principles of translation thoroughly just, yet a version so studious of English idiom rather than of grammatical accuracy, and so loose and paraphrastic as we certainly sometimes find it, would have been a very foundation of sand for the English Bible of the future. It is, then, not without just thankfulness that we find that neither of these versions exercised any appreciable influence whatever either on Tyndale's Testament or on any of those that followed it, unless, indeed, it be the du-glot Testament of Coverdale.

Tyndale's Version thoroughly popular.

A third characteristic of Tyndale's Version must briefly be noticed—that it was designedly a *popular* version. The well-known and often quoted words that "the boy that driveth the plow should know more of the Scripture"† than the theologians of the day, represented truly Tyndale's life-long purpose. It is to this steady aim and purpose that the special and striking idiomatic excellence of the Authorized Version is pre-eminently due. To this deep resolve we owe it that our own English Version is now what we feel it to be—a version speaking to heart and

dale's work seems to have been perfectly independent. See Westcott, *History of English Bible*, p. 176 seq.

* This prologue will be found in Forshall and Madden, *Wicliffite Versions*, p. xxv. seq., and a portion of it in *Historical Account* (Bagster's *Hexapla*), p. 28 seq. The prologue is thoroughly interesting and sensible. He notices his obligation to "Lire [N. de Lyra] in the elde testamente that helpyd full miche in hys werke;" and in reference to translation lays down the general canon that "ye beste translatyng out of Latyne into Englysh is to translate after the sentence, and not only after the wordis." Many a reviser may take this hint.

† The influence exerted by Erasmus and his labors on Tyndale has often been noticed. Even in this familiar quotation it would seem that Tyndale was but reproducing a sentiment from the "Paraclesis" of Erasmus, prefixed to his Testament of 1519. See *Historical Account of the English Versions* (Bagster), p. 43, 44.

soul, and appealing to our deepest religious sensibilities with that mingled simplicity, tenderness, and grandeur that make us often half doubt, as we listen, whether apostles and evangelists are not still exercising their Pentecostal gift, and themselves speaking to us in the very tongue wherein we were born. Verily we may bless and praise God that Tyndale was moved to form this design, and that he was permitted faithfully to adhere to it, for, beyond doubt, it is to that popular element in his version not only that we owe nearly all that is best in our present English Testament, but that there remains to this very hour, in the heart of all earnest English people, an absolute intolerance of any changes in the words or phraseology that would tend to obscure this special, and, we may justly say, this providential characteristic.* Tyndale not only furnished the type for all succeeding versions, but bequeathed principles which will exercise a preservative influence over the version of the English Bible, through every change or revision that may await it, until scriptural revision shall be no longer needed and change shall be no more.

We may now proceed to show by actual comparison the close relation that exists between Tyndale's Version and our present Authorized Version. Three passages have been chosen, not from containing any greater amount of coincidences of expressions than others, but simply as being portions of Scripture of familiar interest and of convenient length.

The first shall be the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, St. Luke xvi., 19–31.

* The eloquent words of Froude, when alluding to the publication of Coverdale's Bible, and its close connection with the labors of Tyndale, may well be cited. The historian justly says, "The peculiar genius—if such a word may be permitted—which breathes through it—the mingled tenderness and majesty—the Saxon simplicity—the preternatural grandeur—unequaled, unapproached in the attempted improvements of modern scholars—all are here, and the impress of the mind of one man—William Tyndal."—*History of England*, vol. iii., p. 84. These words the student will find truly deserved. The more Tyndale's labors are considered, the more will they be valued.

TYNDALE. 1534.

19 Ther was a certayne ryche man, which was clothed in purple & fyne bysse & fared deliciously every daye. 20 And ther was a certayne begger, named Lazarus, whiche laye at his gate full of soores 21 dessyringe to be refresshed with the cromes which fell from the ryche mannes borde. Neverthelesse the dogges came & licked his soores. 22 And yt fortuned that the begger dyed, & was carried by the Angelles into Abrahams bosome. The riche man also died, & was buried.

23 And beinge in hell in tormentes, he lyfte up his eyes & sawe Abraham a farre of, & Lazarus in his bosome 24 & he cryed & sayd: father Abraham have mercy on me & sende Lazarus that he may dippe the tippe of his fynger in water & cole my tonge for I am tourmented in this flame. 25 But Abraham sayd vnto him Sonne, remember that thou in thy lyfe tyme receavedst thy pleasure & contrarywyse Lazarus payne. Now therefore is he comforted, & thou art punyssh-ed. 26 Beyonde all this, bitwene you & vs ther is a greate space set, so that they which wolde goo from hence to you cannot: nether maye come from thence to vs.

27 Then he sayd: I praye the therfore father, send him to my fathers housse. 28 For I have fyve brethren; for to warne them, lest they also come into this place of tourment. 29 Abraham sayd vnto him they have Moses & the Prophetes let them heare them. 30 And he sayd: naye father Abraham, but yf one came unto them, from the ded, they wolde repent. 31 He sayd vnto him: If they heare not Moses & the Prophetes nether will they beleve though one roose from deeth agayne.

AUTH. VERSION. 1611.

19 There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day: 20 And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, 21 And desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover the dogs came and licked his sores. 22 And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried;

23 And in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeing Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. 24 And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. 25 But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. 26 And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that *would come* from thence.

27 Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house: 28 For I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. 29 Abraham said unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. 30 And he said, Nay, father Abraham; but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. 31 And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.

In this passage we observe several interesting differences as well as coincidences.

Comments on the translation.

In verse 19 we should have hardly expected to have found in Tyndale's Version the Grecized "bysse." In Wicliffe's Version the translation is "whight silk," and in Cranmer's "fyne whyte." The more familiar "linen" appears to have come in with Coverdale. In the same verse "deliciously" held its ground in the leading English versions till the last revision. The less accurate "lay," in the following verse, was only changed into the more accurate and suggestive "was laid" in the Bishops' Bible. The translation of the here somewhat peculiar ἀλλὰ καὶ (οἱ κύνες κ.τ.λ.) is curiously varied. Tyndale probably aloner etains the most strictly correct translation of the ἀλλὰ, though he overlooks the καὶ. Coverdale takes the lighter form "but;" Cranmer conveniently lets the adversative particle fall through ("the dogges came also"), and certainly puts the "also" in the wrong place. The Genevan Version falls back on "yea," the A.V. adopts the general but not exact "moreover."*

* The same inexact rendering is retained by Alford, *Auth. Version Revised* (*in loco*). We can hardly doubt, however, that the words convey more than the mere addition of another item to the sorrowful account, though it may be difficult to catch the exact idea intended to be conveyed by the adversative particle. Meyer (*Kommentar*, p. 478, ed. 4), with his usual accuracy, observes that the ἀλλὰ must mark some opposition, the καὶ some enhancement; but we shall find it difficult probably to take his view of the passage, that the dogs increased the beggar's sufferings—"Howbeit (instead of being fed with the crumbs) *the dogs also came and licked his sores*, so increasing pain" (die unreinen Thiere, und ihr den Schmerz des Hülflosen vermehrendes Lecken! Meyer). De Wette, Ewald, and others, following the majority of the older expositors, rightly hold that the dogs must be considered to have shown a sort of compassion—which was not shown to Lazarus by his fellow-men; but they obliterate the force of the ἀλλὰ. Bornemann gives the gloss "egestate ejus micæ de divitis mensâ allatæ vulneribus succurrebant canes," but the same objection remains. Can the meaning be that, though Lazarus desired (and probably received) what really was the portion of the dogs (see Matt. xv., 27), even the dogs *notwithstanding* showed a sort of pity? Meyer urges, on the contrary, that the whole idea of the narrative is the *unrelieved* misery of Lazarus on this side of the grave. The exegesis of these simple words is certainly difficult.

In verse 22 the pleasantly quaint but archaic "yt fortuned," after holding its ground in one or two of the older versions, is conveniently changed into the more natural translation by the last revisers, who probably took it from the Rhemish Version, to which it is certain that they were from time to time indebted, though it was not one of the versions to which they were specially directed to refer.

In verse 23 the A.V. clearly improves upon the older version, and preserves in the simple participle the tragic force, not to say even the tone of the retrospective *ὑπάρχων*, which is quite lost in the resolved "when he was in torments" of the Rhemish Version.

In verse 25 Coverdale adopts, though with an enfeebled order and force of words, the more literal "good" and "evil," and appears to have suggested the change in A.V., all the other versions (except the Rhemish) having followed Tyndale. The same hand introduced "tormented" in the same verse, and passed it onward to Bishop Cox for the Bishops' Bible.

The excellent change in the translation of *χάσμα* (verse 26) is due apparently to the Genevan Version, and is followed by the Bishops'; the scarcely less important "fixed," immediately afterward, appears for the first time in the Rhemish* Version, and is adopted by our own revisers. In the last verse the improved translation of *πεισθήσονται* is due to A.V., all the other versions without exception having here followed the earlier translation.

Second passage, Acts xxvii., 27–44.

The second passage we have chosen is of a more technical character, and useful for showing the amount of connection between the two versions where more verbal change might naturally be expected. The portion

* We can hardly equally commend the rendering of *χάσμα* adopted by this version—"a great *chaos*." The correct translation of the sad and monitory *ἐστήρικται* is found also in Wicliffe ("stablished"), and is due obviously to the "firmatum est" of the Vulgate It may be remarked, in passing, that the idea of a vast *chasm* separating the abodes of the evil and the good is not a Jewish idea. Compare Lightfoot *in loco*, and Eisenmenger, *Entdeckt. Judenthum*, vol. ii., p. 314.

chosen is the concluding part of St. Paul's shipwreck, Acts xxvii., 27–44.

TYNDALE.

27 But when the fourtenthe nyght was come, as we were caryed in Adria about mydnyght, the shipmen demed that ther appered some countre vnto them, 28 & sounded, & founde it xx feddoms. And when they had gone a lytell further they sounded agayne & founde xv feddoms. 29 Then fearinge lest they shuld have fallen on some Roche, they cast iiii ancres out of the sterne & wysshed for the daye. 30 As the shipmen were about to flee out of the ship & had let doune the bote into the see vnder a coloure as tho they wolde have cast ancres out of the forshippe: 31 Paul sayd unto the under captayne & the soudiers excepte these abyde in the ship ye cannot be safe. 32 Then the soudiers cut of the rope of the bote & let it fall awaye.

33 And in the meane tyme betwixt that & daye Paul besought them all to take meate, sayinge: this is the fourtenthe daye that ye have taried & continued fastynge receavinge nothinge at all. 34 Wherfore I praye you to take meate: for this is no dout is for youre helth: for ther shall not a heere fall from the heed of eny of you. 35 And when he had thus spoken, he toke breed & gave thankes to God in presence of them all & brake it & beganne to eate. 36 Then were they all of good cheare, & they also toke meate. 37 We were all together in the ship, two hundred 3 score and sixtene soules. 38 And when they had eaten ynough they lightened the ship & cast out the wheate into the see.

39 When yt was daye they knew not the lande but they spied a certayne haven with a banke, into the which

AUTH. VERSION.

27 But when the fourteenth night was come, as we were driven up and down in Adria, about midnight the shipmen deemed that they drew near to some country; 28 And sounded, and found *it* twenty fathoms: and when they had gone a little further, they sounded again, and found *it* fifteen fathoms. 29 Then fearing lest we should have fallen upon rocks, they cast four anchors out of the stern, and wished for the day. 30 And as the shipmen were about to flee out of the ship, when they had let down the boat into the sea, under colour as though they would have cast anchors out of the foreship, 31 Paul said to the centurion and to the soldiers, Except these abide in the ship, ye can not be saved. 32 Then the soldiers cut off the ropes of the boat, and let her fall off.

33 And while the day was coming on, Paul besought *them* all to take meat, saying, This day is the fourteenth day that ye have tarried and continued fasting, having taken nothing. 34 Wherefore I pray you to take *some* meat; for this is for your health; for there shall not an hair fall from the head of any of you. 35 And when he had thus spoken, he took bread, and gave thanks to God in presence of them all; and when he had broken *it*, he began to eat. 36 Then were they all of good cheer, and they also took *some* meat. 37 And we were in all in the ship two hundred threescore and sixteen souls. 38 And when they had eaten enough, they lightened the ship, and cast out the wheat into the sea.

39 And when it was day, they knew not the land; but they discovered a certain creek with a shore, into the

TYNDALE.

they were mynded (yf yt were possible) to thrust in the ship. [40] And when they had taken up the ancres, they commytted them selves unto the see, & lowsed the rudder bondes & hoysed up the mayne sayle to the wynde & drue to londe. [41] But they chaunsed on a place, which had the see on bothe the sydes, & thrust in the ship. And the foore part stucke fast & moved not, but the hynder brake with the violence of the waves.

[42] The soudears counsell was to kyll the presoners lest eny of them, when he had swome out shulde fle awaye. [43] But the under coptayne willinge to save Paul kept them from their purpose, & commanded that they that could swyme shulde cast them selves first in to the see & scape to londe. [44] And the other he commanded to goo some on bordes & some on broken peces of the ship. And so it came to passe that they come all safe to londe.

AUTH. VERSION.

which they were minded, if it were possible, to thrust in the ship. [40] And when they had taken up the anchors, they committed *themselves* unto the sea, and loosed the rudder bands, and hoised up the mainsail to the wind, and made toward shore. [41] And falling into a place where two seas met, they ran the ship aground; and the forepart stuck fast, and remained unmoveable, but the hinder part was broken with the violence of the waves.

[42] And the soldiers' counsel was to kill the prisoners, lest any of them should swim out, and escape. [43] But the centurion, willing to save Paul, kept them from *their* purpose; and commanded that they which could swim should cast *themselves* first *into the sea*, and get to land: [44] And the rest, some on boards, and some on *broken pieces* of the ship. And so it came to pass, that they escaped all safe to land.

We may here again shortly notice a few of the changes.

Comments on some of the changes.

In verse 27 our own version apparently has the credit of the more vigorous translation of διαφερομένων, the other versions either following Tyndale or the very feeble "as we were sayling" of Cranmer. Some good examples of the true force and meaning of the word will be found in that excellent repertory of illustration, the notes of Wetstein.

In verse 28, Coverdale is apparently the only translator who has ventured on the longer and perhaps more professional "cast out the lead" ("kesten down a plomet," Wicl.): the rest all adopt the shorter and simpler form.

In verse 29, the Genevan Version is the first to be a little more literal in the translation of τραχεῖς τόπους ("rough places"), though in the A. V. the change to the plural at once shows the close care of the revisers, and presents a very fairly approximate rendering.

In verse 30 we may congratulate ourselves on having escaped the "mariners" of the Genevan Version—the only version that has committed itself to this somewhat vapid word. The professional change of gender in verse 32 is found only in A.V. It might have been useful in Tyndale's rendering, to mark that it was not the rope, but the boat that fell away: it is apparently unnecessary in the A.V.

In the first words of verse 33, our version is very happy in the delicate change from "when" ("when the daye beganne to appear," Cran., Bish.; comp. Cov.) to "while," just giving the required shade of meaning so as to be true to the original. Nothing shows more clearly than these slight touches the thorough care and faithfulness with which the last revisers executed their work.

In verse 35 the resolved translation of the participle, "when he had broken it," in the A.V., and derived probably from Cranmer, is scarcely an improvement on the more idiomatic and equally accurate "and [he] brake it and beganne to eate" of the older version. No clauses are more difficult to translate with ease and vigor than the participle clauses in the New Testament, and especially in St. Luke. The varied relations of time, manner, and circumstance will sometimes all be found involved in a group of participles round one solitary finite verb, to exhibit which in a faithful, and, at the same time, easy translation, is commonly very difficult. Here it seems natural to mark by a resolved translation the action that followed the words, but it scarcely seems necessary to mark in the same way the priority of the breaking of the bread to the eating of it. But, after all, these are matters in which individual judgments will necessarily greatly vary.

In the next verse but one a slight difference occurs in the first words which also opens up a subject of some difficulty. Tyndale, it will be observed, with all the other early versions except the Bishops', prefixes no connecting particle to the first words of verse 37. In the original the particle is δέ. Is this a case where the slight change of thought involved in

this delicate use of the particle, and the transition from the acts of the gathered shipmen to the fact of their number, is really best expressed in English by the omission of any connecting particle, or is it a case where some English particle seems needed? Here again judgments will greatly vary. To the majority probably it would seem that a particle is needed, but that majority would be greatly divided whether the exact shade of thought was best conveyed by the loosely connecting "and," or the half-parenthetic and mainly transitional "now." The same question recurs in verse 39, at the beginning of which Tyndale and the versions prior to the Bishops' Bible leave the connecting particle untranslated. These are niceties of translation to which it may not be undesirable in passing to direct the general reader's attention.

In the last words of verse 40 the A. V. is a slight improvement on the earlier version, but both fail in marking that it was the particular shore, or rather beach, which they had already observed.* The Rhemish Version has inserted the article. The translation in the A. V. of *κατεῖχον* is admirable. All the other versions (except Rhem., "they went on toward") retain the less expressive rendering of Tyndale. Here again we have another instance of the watchfulness and care of the last revisers.

In the next verse (verse 41) the change in regard to *ἐιθάλασσος* is not equally for the better. It tends rather to con-

* In this verse the modern reviser would almost certainly introduce a change in the translation of *ἀρτέμων*. The most probable rendering would seem to be "foresail," but the objection is that St. Luke in that case would have been more likely to have used the technical word *ἐόλων*. See, however, the elaborate arguments in the excellent dissertation "On the Ships of the Ancients" in Smith, *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*. The same objection is urged against the supposition that it was some hinder (mizen) sail, there being a technical term, though perhaps not so well known as *ἐόλων*, viz., *ἐπίδρομος*. Meyer notices that this sail in Italian is known by the technical name "artimone," but himself refers the term to some upper sail ("Braamsegel," topsail) attached to the presumably yet standing mast. See *Kommentar zur Apostelgesch.*, p. 455 (ed. 2), and the good notes on the whole passage.

fuse what St. Luke appears to specify, that the vessel was run on to a tongue of land lying below the surface, and connected with the shore by an isthmus, with some little depth of water on it; hence the circumstances of verse 43 seq. The slight but necessary change in the translation of ἐλύετο was taken from the Rhemish Version. To the same version is due the credit of marking in verse 43 that it is there the simpler ἐξιέναι ("goe forth to land"), not as afterward διασωθῆναι. The A. V., however, having taken the hint, improves upon it.

In the last verse, the insertion by Tyndale of the former verb makes the sense clearer; Coverdale was the first to omit it, and is followed by the Bishops' Bible and our own version. At any rate, we can hardly here take a hint from the Rhemish—"and the rest, some *they caried* on bordes." Such a proceeding would certainly have been a little difficult in such a locality, and with some depth of water on the isthmus.

Third passage, 2 Thess., chap. ii.

The third passage which we may select is a very different one, and so not unsuitable for testing the connection between the versions. We take the second chapter of the second Epistle to the Thessalonians, in which the apostle specifies the signs and coming of Antichrist.

TYNDALE.

2. We beseche you brethren by the commynge of oure lorde Jesu Christ, and in that we shall assemble vnto him, [2] that ye be not sodenly moved from youre mynde, and be not troubled, nether by sprete, nether by wordes, nor yet by letter which shuld seme to come from vs, as the daye of Christ were at honde. [3] Let no man deceave you by eny meanes, for the lorde commeth not, excepte there come a departynge fyrst, and that that synfull man be opened, the sonne of perdicion [4] which is an adversarie, and is exalted above all that is called god, or that is worshipped: so that he shall sitt as God in temple of god, and shew him silfe as god.

AUTH. VERSION.

2. Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and *by* our gathering together unto him, [2] That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. [3] Let no man deceive you by any means; for *that day shall not come*, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; [4] Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.

TYNDALE.

[5] Remember ye not, that when I was yet with you, I tolde you these thynges? [6] And nowe ye knowe what with holdeth: even that he myght be vttered at his tyme. [7] For the mistery of that iniquitie doeth he all readie worke which onlie loketh, vntill it be taken out of the waye. [8] And then shall that wicked be vttered, whom the lorde shall consume with the sprete of his mouth, and shall destroye with the apearaunce of his commynge, [9] even him whose commynge is by the workynge of Satan, with all lyinge power, signes and wonders: [10] and in all deceavablenes of vnrightewesnes, amonge them that perysshe: because they receaved not the (love) of the truth, that thay myght have bene saved. [11] And therfore god shall sende them stronge delusion, that they shuld beleve lyes: [12] that all they might be damned which beleved not the trueth but had pleasure in vnrightewesnes.

[13] But we are bounde to geve thankes alwaye to god for you brethren beloved of the lorde, for because that God hath from the begynnynge chosen you to salvacion, thorow santifyinge of the sprete, and thorowe belevynge the trueth: [14] wherunto he called you by oure gospell, to obtayne the glorye that commeth of oure lorde Jesu Christ.

[15] Therfore brethren stonde fast and kepe the ordinannces which ye have learned: whether it were by our preachynge, or by pistle. [16] Oure lorde Jesu Christ hymsilfe, and God oure father which hath loved us and hath geven us everlastynge consolacion and good hope thorowe grace, [17] comforte youre hertes, and stablysshe you in all doctrine and good doynge.

AUTH. VERSION.

[5] Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? [6] And now ye know what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time. [7] For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth *will let*, until he be taken out of the way. [8] And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: [9] *Even him*, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, [10] And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. [11] And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: [12] That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.

[13] But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth: [14] Whereunto he called you by our Gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.

[15] Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle. [16] Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given *us* everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, [17] Comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work.

Comments.

In the first verse the A. V. adopts and improves upon the translation of the Bishops' Bible, "our assembling unto him," and so rightly avoids a very awkward periphrasis.

In the second verse the older version is certainly the more accurate in its translation of ἀπὸ τοῦ νοός ("from youre mynde"), but in what follows it is much improved upon, both in the Bishops' and the A. V.

The change in verse 3 to "falling away" is due to the Bishops', and is a clear improvement, but the definite article ought not to have been overlooked; it was *the* definite falling away which was to precede the coming. In the conclusion of the verse we owe the vigorous translation, "the man of sin," to the usually smoother Coverdale. The reading, it may be observed, is somewhat doubtful, as the two most ancient manuscripts (the Vatican and Sinaitic) read ἀνομίας. This, however, would not affect the principle of the translation, but only the change from "sin" to "lawlessness."

In verse 4 there are some small changes, and all for the better, part due to Bishops', part to the A. V.

In verse 7 we find that Tyndale and most of the earlier versions were induced to emphasize the article τῆς ἀνομίας: it need scarcely be said that it appears only on that well-known principle that if, of two nouns in regimen, the first has the article, the second will also have it without being thereby made peculiarly definite. In the latter portion of the verse, the Genevan Version has the merit of having first brought out the correct meaning.

In verse 8 the translation of Bishops' followed by A. V. is perhaps questionable. It is doubtful whether any thing more is meant than that "manifestation" and final "appearance" of the Lord, which seems always specially marked by the word ἐπιφάνεια.

In verse 9 it may also be doubted whether, in point of actual structure, Tyndale is not right, and whether the gen. ψεύδους is not to be associated with all the three substantives,

not, as in A. V., only with the last one: "power," "signs," and "wonders" were all marked by the same principle.

In verse 11 a change is made from the plural "lies" to the singular, but all the versions alike omit the article. In the next verse two very small changes appear, both, however, serving to exhibit that incessant care which, as we have already seen, so marks the Authorized Version; the earlier versions preserving Tyndale's words as they stand.

The same remark applies to verse 13, where there are also two or three small changes, one, however, of which is of some little importance, viz., the omission in the A. V. of the preposition ("thorowe") in accordance with the Greek. This exactness is unfortunately not always observed in our version, but in any future revision it is to be hoped that it would be systematically maintained; several passages being affected by the principle even in their doctrinal aspects.* It is a matter of common sense that if the two substantives have only one preposition, the writer instinctively regards the subjects or ideas expressed by the two substantives as so far allied that they may suitably stand under the vinculum of the single preposition.

The next verse (verse 14) presents an interesting differ-

* We may take a single but important instance. In John iii., 5, the words *ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ Πνεύματος* are translated, not only in the A.V., but in all the versions, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit"—the preposition being inserted before the second substantive, though not so inserted in the Greek. Now it can hardly be doubted, when we come closely to reason on the passage, that this insertion of the preposition tends to refer the *γέννησις* to two media or mediating agencies which need not by any means be regarded as combined. This, however, the Greek does not imply. Nay, the very absence of the preposition, when it might have been so easily inserted, suggests the *contrary* deduction—the rule of Winer being undoubtedly correct, that the preposition "*is repeated* when the nouns denote objects which are to be taken by themselves as independent, and *not repeated* when they reduce themselves to a single main idea, or (if they are proper names) to one common class:" contrast Luke xxiv., 27; John xx., 2 (on which Bengel bases an actual deduction—"non una fuisse utrumque discipulum"), and 1 Thess. i., 5, with John iv., 23, Luke xxi., 26, and the present passage. See, on this subject, Winer, *Grammar of the N. T.*, § 50, p. 522 (ed. Moulton), and the ample list of examples there specified.

ence. Here Tyndale gives a direct interpretation: he regards the genitive τοῦ Κυρίου κ.τ.λ. as a genitive of the *source*, and marks it distinctly in translation. In this view he is followed by Taverner, and, as far as we remember, Taverner alone. Coverdale's and all the remaining versions adopt the simple translation, and so rightly avoid *interpretation*. Christ is here obviously represented, in harmony with the whole tenor of the passage, and, indeed, the analogy of Scripture, as the *possessor* of the glory rather than the source of it.*

The beginning of verse 15 brings out a polemical difference. The A. V., with really considerable boldness, here follows the Rhemish Version in opposition to all the earlier versions, and gives to παραδόσεις its not unusual sense of "traditions." Exegetical considerations, however, make it very doubtful whether the Genevan "instructions" is not more in coincidence with the general tenor of the passage and Epistle.

We may close the comparison of the two versions by noticing one important form of words, ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν, which, as it will be observed, is differently translated in the two versions, Tyndale dropping the καὶ in translation, the A. V., on the contrary, rather giving it emphasis. There is yet a third translation possible, which we first find in the Bishops' Bible—"God and our Father;" which of these is to be preferred? Perhaps the last, as implying that we regard

* There is no case to which more attention ought to be given in the N. T. than to the genitive. There are at least five or six different uses which should be carefully studied, as doctrinal deductions of considerable importance will be often found to depend on the view taken. We have, for instance, a gen. of possession as here; of origin (Col. ii., 8); of originating cause (Col. i., 23; 1 Thess. i., 6); of characterizing quality (Gal. v., 1); of material (Phil. iii., 21); of contents (1 Thess. ii., 5); of opposition (Eph. vi., 14); of point of view (Phil. ii., 30); and the general divisions of the gen. *subjecti* and *objecti*, the due distinction between which always tests the accuracy of thought and perspicacity of the interpreter. The reader who desires to pursue this subject will find in the notes on the above passages in the *Commentaries* of the writer of this note further references and comments. In the otherwise excellent Grammar of Winer the cases (and especially the gen.) are not treated with the clearness which marks other parts of the work.

the holy words "God and Father"* as a solemn title in which Godhood and Fatherhood were simultaneously recognized in the devout mind of the believer. The A. V. is very inconstant in its translation of these words, and would have here to be watched closely in any new revision. The passage concludes with a clearly necessary correction on the part of the A. V., "good word and work," though in this our version was only following, as to the position of the epithet, the earlier versions of Cranmer and of the Bishops.

After the above comparisons really little remains to be said, such passages as have just been chosen serving to bring out practically the actual facts of the case. In the first place, we see clearly that our own version is and remains substantially that of Tyndale. All that makes it what it essentially is, its language, tone, rhythm, vigor, and breadth, are due to this first devoted translator from the original. At the same time, and in the second place, we have observed manifold small changes, their number greatly increasing as the difficulties of the passage increase, or as we pass from narrative to argument. How and whence these changes came in is the only question that remains to be answered. This may be done shortly, and without entering far into the province of the history of the English Bible.

Coverdale's Version.

Even from the passing comments that have been made, it would have become clear to the general reader that each succeeding version contributed something by way of correction and change to the labors of Tyndale. Much is due to Coverdale, who of late, we think, has been unduly depreciated. It may be that he was a second-rate man compared with Tyndale; it may be, too, that his

* On this solemn form of words see the notes *on Gal.* i., 5, where the subject is somewhat fully discussed. Whichever view be taken, there certainly ought to be uniformity in translation. This formula, as translated in the A. V., supplies one of the many proofs of the undesirableness of the arrangement of different companies of translators or revisers for different portions of Scripture. All portions of the N. T. ought to be gone over together by the same body of revisers.

knowledge of the original languages was at first very moderate; it may be, also, that he was appointed to his work rather than inwardly called to it, as was the case of his friend. But he certainly labored faithfully and in many respects successfully. He was also thoroughly loyal to Tyndale; he never sought to supersede the early version, but rather by the aid of others to supply such contributions, by way of addition and correction, as God enabled him to make to a great and holy cause. At the same time, this also seems clear that Coverdale's Version can hardly be considered in the line of direct descent from Tyndale to the Authorized Version. Though less remote than Taverner's, Coverdale's Version can scarcely be considered as much more than *collaterally* related to our present English Bible. The line was clearly continued by Matthew, or, to drop the *nom de plume*, the martyr John Rogers. In this edition we have little more, in regard of the New Testament, than Tyndale's standard edition of 1534, occasionally corrected by Tyndale's own edition of 1535 and the edition of Coverdale of the same year. Matthew's Bible appeared in 1537, and was so far approved by authority that the circulation of it was sanctioned by the king. Thus wonderfully and mysteriously was Tyndale's dying prayer of a few months before, "Lord, ope the King of England's eyes," heard and answered. The work of one martyr, edited by one who afterward wore the same mystic crown, was the first Authorized Version of the Church of England.*

The line is continued by the Great Bible, or Cranmer's

* The estimate of Coverdale's share in the great work of Bible-translation is extremely well stated in the *Historical Account* prefixed to Bagster, *Hexapla*, p. 71 seq. From this account it would seem that Coverdale in no way wished even to seem to interfere with Tyndale's labors; that Tyndale's New Testament was certainly one of the authorities he used; that his Bible was *permitted* by the king to be used; and that the king *intended* to have formally authorized it, but that the intention was never actually carried out. It is therefore hardly correct to call it, as has been called in a recent essay, "The first authorized version." See *Quarterly Review* for April, 1870, p. 319. This honor certainly belongs to Matthew's Bible. See *Historical Account*, p. 78.

Bible, which was published three years later. The archbishop, as we know from Fox's Manuscript preserved by Strype,* began the work by taking "an old English translation" of the New Testament—almost certainly Tyndale's—which he divided into eight or nine parts, and gave, copied out "at large in a paper book," to his coadjutors. This recension, it can hardly be doubted, was the New Testament of the Great Bible, which, as inspection clearly shows, was a revised edition of Tyndale. Among the archbishop's coadjutors were probably Tonstall, Bishop of Durham, and Heath, Bishop of Rochester, who are subsequently specified in the title-page of the edition of 1541 as "overseers and perusers" of the work; Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, who appears to have been the reviser of the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John; Stokesley, Bishop of London, to whom the Acts of the Apostles were assigned, and four or five others. Coverdale was very properly chosen as the corrector of the press and practical editor, but there does not seem reason for thinking that he had much, if, indeed, any thing to do with the actual work of revision. This interesting and important version maintained its ground during the whole of the remainder of Henry's reign, and—after the short interval of Mary's reign—during the first ten years of the reign of Elizabeth, until at length it was superseded by the Bishops' Bible in 1568. It thus was the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures for nearly a generation, and still maintains some place in our services (in the Prayer-book version of the Psalms, and in the sentences of Scripture in the Communion Service) unto this very day.

The Great Bible.

Our attention must now be turned to the Genevan Version, which, though collaterally related to our present version, and not in the line of what may be called authorized descent, nevertheless has been the source from which many corrections have been introduced. The New

The Genevan Version.

* See Strype, *Cranmer*, book i., ch. viii., vol. i., p. 48 (Oxford, 1812), and the full notice in *Historical Account*, p. 80.

Testament was published first under the superintendence of William Whittingham, afterward Dean of Durham, in the year 1557, at Geneva, and afterward, with many alterations, in 1560, when the whole Bible was published. Among those who took part in the whole work was the veteran Coverdale, Thomas Sampson, afterward Dean of Christchurch, Thomas Cole, afterward Archdeacon of Essex, Christopher Goodman, and others. The work was done well, though by no means without indications, in the New Testament especially, of bias and doctrinal prejudices. The greater part of the changes in the New Testament are referable to the work of a good interpreter, though a rash and inexperienced critic—the version and notes of Beza; but there are throughout clear signs that great care and consideration were shown in the adoption of these changes, and that, on the whole, the labor was well bestowed. This version, as is well known, was very popular, and maintained its ground against the Bishops' Bible, and, for some years, even against our present version. It was the household, though not the authorized, version of the Scriptures for fully two generations.

This version deserves our attention in three respects: first, as having introduced the use of italics to supplement and carry on the sense, and also, though less happily, the *separation* into verses; secondly, as showing some desire on the part of the revisers to follow as critically correct a text as their limited knowledge and appliances, and (it might be added) their deference to Beza's authority, permitted them to recognize; thirdly, as being the first version which had been made in *co-operative union*. All the preceding versions had been the work, either wholly or in their separate parts, of individuals. In this version we had several earnest and competently learned men working together, and, as might be expected, finally producing a work which, whatever may be its faults and prejudices, certainly presents an aspect of considerable unity and harmony in its general execution. This is a hint which is not now without its value and significance.

As we have already said, it stands only in a collateral relation to our own version, but it has supplied a fairly large contingent of corrections.

The Bishops' Bible.

What we have termed the authorized line of descent was continued by the Bishops' Bible, from which our own version is legitimately derived, the general and leading instruction being given to the revisers of 1611 to introduce "as few alterations as may be" in the then current version. On this version a few remarks may be made as to structure and general characteristics.

It appears to have been undertaken from two different reasons: first, honest dissatisfaction with Cranmer's Bible as expressed by distinguished scholars, such as Lawrence, and men of influence such as Sandys, then Bishop of Worcester; secondly, from the fear of the rapidly increasing influence and circulation of the Genevan Version. These two causes induced Archbishop Parker to call in the aid of eight of his suffragans and of other learned men of the day, and with them to bring out a thoroughly revised version based on that of Cranmer. The work was completed in 1568. Of the New Testament, the Gospels were revised by Cox, Bishop of Ely, the Romans by Guest, Bishop of Rochester, and the First Epistle to the Corinthians by Goodman, Dean of Westminster. No clew is afforded to the revisers of the remaining books. The work was done creditably though unequally, but it nowhere appears to have been the result of actual conference and locally united labor. Though confessedly showing a much more thorough revision of existing materials than seems to have been the case with its predecessor, the Great Bible, though Parker's recension was much more complete than Cranmer's, yet still it had all the faults and defects which were almost necessarily due to its mode of construction, and it certainly never succeeded in thoroughly commanding the respect of scholars or in securing the sympathies of the people. So it maintained its position during the forty-three years of its authorized existence more by external au-

thority than by any special merits of its own. It probably remained in many churches several years after the present version, and, as we know from extant sermons, still continued in many cases to be the source of the words of the preacher's text,* but its real hold on the Church and the nation was never strong, and was soon finally loosened by the increased recognition of the real excellence of the present Authorized Version.

We have now concluded our genealogy of our present version, and established, we hope, both the correctness of the pedigree already specified, and this important fact—that our English Testament of the present day, after all its changes, revisions, and remodelings, is still truly and substantially the venerable version of Tyndale the Martyr. God give us wisdom ever to conduct our consultations in reference to the revision of such a version with a sensitive remembrance of the true source of our present noble inheritance. On its pages are the enduring traces of the labors of a noble and devoted life, and the seal with which it is sealed is the seal of blood.

Principles of our present version.

We may now turn to the second question of the present chapter, and consider shortly the principles which have been followed in the construction of our present version. These have been already in some degree touched upon in the preceding pages, but may now be more distinctly specified. We will first notice the leading principles, and then those general instructions that were prescribed for the carrying out of the work which necessarily involve matters of detail.

* Perhaps a stronger instance could hardly be selected than that of the texts to the Sermons of Bp. Andrewes, preached after 1611, which are taken from the Bishops' Bible. And yet Andrewes was one of the revisers of that very version, and, as chairman of the first of the two companies that sat at Westminster, and a well-known scholar, might naturally be supposed likely to have adopted the new version, especially as some of the sermons were preached as late as ten years after its appearance. The slow progress of the Auth. Version, and the difficulties with which it had to contend in circulation, have been shortly noticed by Disraeli, *Curiosities of Literature* (Series 2), vol. iii., p. 322.

The leading principles were thoroughly sound, and in perfect harmony with the past history of the English Version. These were, first, a division of labor. Separate portions of the Holy Scriptures were assigned to different companies of scholars, and the work done by each company was reviewed by all the other companies, and finally passed under the Committee of Revision. As there were in all six companies, two at Westminster appointed by the king (to whom the credit of the plan is justly due), two at Oxford nominated by the University, and two at Cambridge similarly nominated, and as the numbers in each company varied from seven to ten, it has been computed that no part of the work would have been examined less than fourteen times, and some parts as many as seventeen.* With this principle of division of labor there was thus combined the principle of mutual revision of the work done. Here we observe a great improvement over the plans, as far as we know them, which were followed in the earlier revisions. In Cranmer's and Parker's recensions the work was similarly broken up into parts, but each part was assigned merely to an individual; and no arrangement seems to have been made in either case for any review by the rest of the work done by the individual, nor was there any adjustment by which united conference was provided for. If we may institute a rough comparison between the revisions, we may perhaps

First; division of labor.

* See *Historical Account* (Bagster), p. 153. Though the work was thus done with extreme care and subjected to repeated scrutiny, still the system of companies of translators rather than of one body, or rather two bodies, the one for the Old and the other for the New Testament, each body doing their whole work *in union*, has certainly left its unfavorable traces on our present version. The New Testament was divided between two companies—one of eight persons, of which Dr. Ravis, Dean of Christchurch, and subsequently Bishop of Gloucester and of London, was president, and the other of eight persons, over whom Dr. Barlow, Bishop of Rochester and subsequently Bishop of London, presided. The former sat at Oxford, and took the Gospels, Acts, and Revelation; the latter took the Epistles, and sat at Westminster. Had these fifteen men sat regularly together at the same place, the revision of the New Testament would have been better in itself, and (what is of importance) more evenly executed.

rightly say that the two earlier revisions (at any rate of the New Testament) were due chiefly to the action and influence of the Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being,* and that the laborers in the work were chiefly bishops; that the last revision was due chiefly to the influence of the sovereign, and that the laborers were in the greater part nominated by the Universities. The first two revisions were thus archiepiscopal and episcopal, the last royal and academic. If there is yet to be another revision, it seems likely that a third and different agency will direct and carry out the work of the future, and that at length the Convocation of the Church of England, sustained by the aid and sympathies of the nation, will come forward as the faithful reviser of the national version of the Book of Life. Up to the present time, it must be said, Convocation has failed in one of its great duties as a representative, imperfect it may be, but still a representative, of the local Church in her holy office as guardian of the archives of the Truth. Up to the present time Convocation has been found wanting;† in the future there seems reason to hope

* This, of course, is not to be understood exclusively, Cromwell having had so great a hand in the proceedings prior to the publication of the Great Bible. From the beginning, however, it seems correct to ascribe to Cranmer, especially in reference to the New Testament, the foremost place in the movement. The division of work above alluded to as marked out by Cranmer, and the recension which appears to have resulted from it, and which ultimately appears to have formed the New Testament of the Great Bible, seem to justify the reference, at any rate of the N. T., to the Archbishop of Canterbury. See the *Printed Account* (Bagster), p. 83.

† Convocation has more than once moved in the subject, but never with heartiness or success. Its first indication of movement was in that very critical period in the history of the English Bible which immediately followed the publication of Tyndale's Version of 1534, and was just prior to the appearance of Coverdale's. Convocation then intimated an intention of taking up the work of a new translation. As, however, it was soon seen by Cromwell that the carrying out of this intention would be delayed almost indefinitely, Coverdale was appointed to the work, and the intention of Convocation fell through. Again, at another important period, after the publication of the Great Bible, when there was a clear desire for a new revision, Convocation undertook to form a plan, but the preparations were really so very tiresome and hopeless (see Fuller, *Church History*, book v., 4, p. 237 seq., Lond., 1655; Joyce, *Sacred Synods*, chap. xi., p. 406) that the work was transferred to the

that Convocation will bear its rightful part in the holy and responsible work.

But, to return to the revision of 1611, the first of the leading principles was, as we have seen, thoroughly sound. Where it might have been improved, and where probably it would be improved in any future attempt, would be in a more distinct separation between the revisers of the versions of the Old and of the New Testament. Knowledge has now so widely increased, and the tendency to specialty in knowledge is now so distinct a characteristic of our present times, that it would now be very undesirable for the work of the reviser of any part of the version of the Old Testament to be subjected to the correcting eye of a reviser connected with the New Testament. The two companies must now work separately, but their work might beneficially, as in the time of King James, be laid before a small Committee of Revision. It would, of course, also be necessary that both companies, before addressing themselves to their separate work, should come to a thorough agreement on all details as regards the nature and amount of revision, and the general character of the language to be used, where a change of rendering might be found necessary. This last matter, as we have already seen, is one of considerable importance, and one on which the general acceptance of the work would be found very greatly to depend. The first leading principle, then, of the last revision is to be thoroughly approved of, and the manner in which it was carried out may very profitably be borne well in mind; but, at the present time, modifications would certainly be desirable, not only in what has been already specified, but even in the numbers employed and the mode of meeting. We should do the work better if the number (for the O. T.) were less, and *especially* if the work of revision were carried on round a common table. There would then be a unity in the whole, and a harmony in the general tone

Universities, and when there, as might be supposed, never allowed to be proceeded with. See, for further details, *Historical Account*, p. 105 seq.

of the corrections which, it must be frankly said, is certainly often wanting in our Authorized Version.

Secondly; as few changes as possible.

The second leading principle was one which can not be too strongly commended—to introduce as few alterations as it may be into the current version. On the precise nature and amount of the alterations that may from time to time be considered requisite, there will be varying opinions; but it certainly was a wise as well as a charitable principle to make as little alteration as possible in a version which had been bound up with the devotional feelings of the people, at least as far as the hearing of the ear went. It was wise, too, to follow that principle of minimum alteration which had been instinctively followed from the edition of Matthew down to the time of the last revision. And what was deemed wise and charitable then, would be obviously much more so now, when the necessity for alteration has become diminished by successive revisions, and when that which is to be revised has for more than 250 years, unlike the Bishops' Bible, been valued in the closet, the household, and the Church with equal affection and veneration.

These two principles of combined labor and minimized alteration are the two that may be considered the leading principles of the revision of 1611. For the most part they seem to have been followed out faithfully and persistently.

Minor principles.

Of the minor principles we may notice three, as being of some importance in forming a right estimate of the Authorized Version, and also as being worthy of consideration in reference to any future revision.

Authorities to be consulted.

The first of these relates to the authorities to which the revisers were to have recourse when they happened to agree better with the original than the Bishops' Bible. These are specified in the instructions as the versions of Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Whitchurch (*i. e.*, Cranmer—Whitchurch and Grafton having been the printers), and the Genevan Version. The rule was good, but it may be said generally that it was not very carefully follow-

ed, except perhaps in the case of the Genevan Version. Had they followed it more closely they would have removed several errors which they left remaining,* and have avoided some which they introduced. The authorities on which the revisers seem mainly to have relied are Beza's Latin Version and notes, the Genevan, and the Rhemish Version. To this last version, though it was not in the list of their authorities, they were certainly more than occasionally indebted, and commonly with advantage; as the Rhemish, with all its faults and asperities, was a translation of a really good version, and, at any rate, is very affluent in its vocabulary, and very useful in converting Latin words into English service.† While, then, they judiciously used existing material, and, as we know from Selden and from their own preface, did not neglect versions in other and modern languages, it still does seem to be a fact that they did not very carefully attend to the versions that were specified; inspection seeming to corroborate the remark that when they made an alteration in the Bishops' Bible they rarely went back to an earlier version.

Variation in the renderings.

A second principle which they tell us in the preface they had considered themselves at liberty to follow was that of varying the translations of the same Greek word, even when the sense might seem to be identical. Now in this they were certainly following precedent, as in Coverdale's Bible especially, and, indeed, in all the earlier versions, there is a well-defined tendency to use synonyms. But it was carried much too far. There are passages in the Synoptical Gospels in which several continuous words, and

* To name one out of several instances of some degree of importance, we may notice the translation of *ποίμνη* in John x., 16. Our own version retains the incorrect translation "fold" which had come in with the Great Bible. Had the revisers turned to Tyndale they could hardly have failed to have reverted to his correct translation "flock." They would thus not only have correctly maintained the lexical distinction between *ποίμνη* and the preceding *αὐλή*, but also have precluded an erroneous doctrinal deduction which it is obvious may be made, and has often been made, from the passage.

† See Westcott, *History of the English Bible*, p. 328.

even sentences, identical in the Greek, are translated with needless diversity;* and there are passages of grave doctrinal import, such, for example, as Matt. xxv., 46, in which the revisers ought certainly to have corrected the earlier versions, and to have preserved the same translation of the word in both classes. No doubt there are many passages in which the tenor of the context does really prescribe a variation from the meaning usually assigned, and where the truest translation is not that which is the most mechanically consistent with some apparently similar use of the same words; but our last translators, like their predecessors, seem certainly to have used a liberty which occasionally degenerated into license, and which the reviser of our own day would have to subject to very close and watchful consideration.

Retention of the ecclesiastical words.

The remaining principle which we may notice is embodied in the instruction which prescribes the retention of the old ecclesiastical words, as, for example, "Church" rather than "congregation;" "baptism," not "washing." This principle has been as fairly followed as could have been expected in the case of so loose a definition as "ecclesiastical;" but several instances (*e. g.*, "overseers," Acts xx., 28) have been specified in which the rule has not been observed, and in which also there is some reason to fear that polemical considerations were allowed to intrude. The change in 1 Cor. xiii., 1 seq., of the "love" of the older versions to "charity" may have arisen from a supposed application of

* A good paper on this subject by Dean Alford, with many examples, will be found in the *Contemporary Review* for 1868, vol. viii., p. 322 seq. Diversity of rendering within proper bounds is, however, often necessary for a truly faithful and idiomatic translation. The converse principle, formally enunciated by Newcome, and even very recently put forward in Convocation (see *Guardian* for May 11, p. 550), that the same word in the original ought always to be translated by the same word in English, certainly can not always be maintained. The word in the original is often more inclusive in its meaning than the English word, and the context so different, that a version constructed on a rigid observance of such a principle would frequently be found unreadable, and to general ears sometimes almost unintelligible. See some comments on this in the *Westminster Review* for Jan., 1857, vol. xi., p. 143.

the principle, but in this particular case, at any rate, we shall probably all sincerely wish that no such application had been made. This principle would require very careful consideration in any future revision. It appears, indeed, to have been the cause of some little solicitude at the time, as there are traces of a desire on the part of the king and others to have a small overlooking council of divines specially to see that this and a similar rule were attended to.* In the revision of the future, however, there would probably be less difficulty. Common consent has now associated a certain translation with certain doctrinal and ecclesiastical words. This translation would of course be maintained; care only would be necessary to see that it was maintained consistently, dogmatical or other considerations notwithstanding.

Division of the chapters.

One minor instruction yet remains to be noticed, viz., that the division of the chapters was "to be altered either not at all, or as little as may be, if necessity so require." Here at least we may express the hope that the otherwise safe principle of a minimum of alteration will be observed in any future revision. Convenience would seem to suggest that the numbering, though not the mode of printing the verses, might still be maintained, but the whole subject of changing the present division into chapters, especially in the New Testament, will, we hope, be thoroughly considered.† The recent recommendations of the Ritual Com-

* See *Historical Account* (Bagster), p. 153. Some anxiety has been manifested on this subject in recent newspaper letters, but without any reason. It has been feared that Nonconformists would demand changes in such words as "Church" and "baptize." We venture to say for them that no fear need be entertained on such a subject. The Baptist scholar, for instance, would never press for a new translation of *βαπτίζω* as a Baptist—"baptize" having to him and his co-religionists a meaning as definite as it has to us, and being accepted accordingly. All he would press for would be, as a scholar, that where the context permitted, uniformity of translation should be maintained in this and all other words of importance, ecclesiastical or otherwise.

† Attention may here rightly be called to the two forms of a Paragraph Bible published by the Religious Tract Society. The divisions adopted are evidently the result of much care and consideration, and will commonly be found to commend themselves to the reader. An article of some interest on

mission in reference to the Lectionary will probably, if they become law, tend at once to introduce some other change, and perhaps may supply the general outline for a remodeling of the present divisions. It is well known to scholars that in the New Testament we have an admirable system of sections in some of the older manuscripts, especially in the Vatican Manuscript. These, of course, would have to be carefully reviewed, but it is probable that they might be found too short for general adoption, and that some division like that of the revised Lectionary might, on the whole, be most available.

We have now fairly concluded our lengthened survey of the leading characteristics of the Authorized Version, and the interesting relations in which it stands to the versions that have preceded it. We have seen, and, it is to be hoped, appreciated, the wise and leading principle of minimized alteration and guarded change that has prevailed from the very first, amid all the varying circumstances of civil and ecclesiastical history.* That this principle may be faithfully maintained in any future revision must be the hope and prayer of every earnest Englishman, and that it *will* be maintained we are as fully persuaded as we are of the perpetual presence of the Lord in our mother Church.

With this feeling, and with a loyal adherence to the leading principles that have now been specified, we may at once pass onward to the difficulties which the succeeding chapter will present, and consider, generally and popularly, what would seem to be the limits to which revision should be carefully confined.

Paragraph Bibles will be found in the *Edinburg Review* for Oct., 1855, vol. cii., p. 419 seq.

* Even in the troublous times which preceded the Restoration the subject of revision was not entirely overlooked. It is noticed by Prof. Plumptre that the question was brought before the Grand Committee of Religion in the House of Commons in Jan., 1656, and referred to a sub-committee, which, however, never seems to have reported. See Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii., p. 1678.

## CHAPTER IV.

### NATURE AND LIMITS OF REVISION.

Different opinions as to extent of revision.

We have now before us a difficult portion of the subject, and one on which some preliminary consideration is especially necessary. That a revision is desirable would seem to be the opinion of the majority of thoughtful and unprejudiced persons, but how far that revision should extend is a matter in which we observe great diversity of sentiment. In the minds of some, revision means only sober and guarded change, there, and there only, where truth and faithfulness positively require it. In the minds of others it is simply synonymous with rashness and innovation: our venerable version is to be disfigured and Frenchified; our familiar religious words are to be altered; all that is dear to the simple and devout believer is to be cleared away by modern criticism or marred by inconsiderate change.

That writers and thinkers of this latter class show plainly that they know very little of the history of the English Bible, and very inadequately estimate the deep conservatism in the English mind in regard of the one Book, is perfectly evident; but that they obtain a sort of hearing is also clear, and that they tend to import prejudice and bias into the whole subject is unfortunately clearer still.

With such writers and thinkers it is impossible to argue. Antecedent prejudice renders them commonly impervious to the force of fair considerations, and leaves them only in the attitude of half-angry opposition. Such opponents we can not hope to conciliate; but there are many, very many, deeply interested in the subject, who do confessedly feel great anxiety as to the degree of revision to which a nineteenth century might advance. Even considerations, such as those

of the preceding chapter, drawn from the history of former revisions, fail to satisfy; as the not unreasonable fear is ever ready to show itself, that this principle of least possible alteration, which prevailed when revision followed revision at no lengthened interval, might be much endangered now from the simple fact that more than two hundred and fifty years have come and gone since the date of the last, and that the very lapse of time and the changes of language and expression necessarily due to it must, by the very nature of the case, seriously affect the question.

Such anticipations are not unnatural; such implied objections are perfectly fair and reasonable; but the answer seems conclusive — that the version we are considering has really fixed, to a great degree, the standard of our general as well as of our theological language, and that the English Bible is really our first English classic, as well as the Book of Life and Truth. It may be added, too, that, in a literary point of view, the whole question of language is in a far better state than it was a hundred or a hundred and fifty years ago.* The wretched attempts at revision in the past century, if compared even with the worst and most pretentious efforts of the present century, will show very convincingly that the argument derived from the long interval has no real weight, and that no revision in the present day could hope to meet with an hour's acceptance if it failed to preserve the tone, rhythm, and diction of the present Authorized Version.†

* See Abp. Trench *On the Auth. Version of the New Test.*, p. 25, where some specimens are given of the unhappy revisions of the eighteenth century. The remarks in the work just referred to on "the English of our Version" (chap. ii.) are especially deserving of attention.

† Nothing is more satisfactory at the present time than the evident feelings of veneration for our Authorized Version, and the very generally-felt desire for as little change as possible. In a recent leading article on this subject in the *Times* of May 6 the writer very properly presses on the revisers a salutary caution—"that it should be their aim not to make as many, but to make as few, alterations as possible;" and justly remarks that "it will often be much better to sacrifice a point of strict grammatical accuracy than to jar the ear and lose the sympathy of readers."

We may dismiss, then, this class of objections and objectors, and now turn to the really difficult question which the present chapter places before us—To what extent is revision to be carried? On what principles are alterations to be introduced, and how far is exact scholarship to be allowed to modify when the case is not one of actual *error?* Unless some answer is attempted to primary questions such as these, revision will be a leap in the dark. It will be either so occasional and superficial that the usual *argumentum inertiæ*—viz., that if there is to be so little change, it is really not desirable to disturb the minds of devout persons by touching the Book at all—will certainly consign the work, when done, to the oblivion that fortunately has been the fate of so many revisions; or, on the other hand, it will be of such an uneven character (alteration always having a tendency to accelerate, and revisers being always dangerously open to the temptation of using with increasing freedom acquired facilities), that the uniform character of the present version will always hold its own against the irregular development of its temporary rival. Principles, then, must be laid down, though at the same time we confess, if there is to be real success, there must always be in reserve a dispensing power for passages where from varied reasons, textual, exegetical, and linguistic, the old rendering must be left untouched. It is here where the great difficulty of the work will be felt, and here also where no rules *can* be laid down, but where we can ultimately trust to nothing but to sensitive judgment, and to the acquired tact of a watchful experience. Subject to such a necessary limitation, we may now endeavor to state and classify those cases to which revision may be properly applied. We will begin with those about which there will be least doubt, and advance gradually to the point where a just conservatism, and a due regard to the principles already laid down, seem fairly to stop us.

Extent of revision considered in detail.

The first class of passages demanding correction will always be those where there is clear and plain *error*, and where

the incorrectness would be recognized by any competent scholar to whom the passage was submitted. Here our duty is obvious. Faithfulness, and loyalty to God's truth, require that the correction should be made unhesitatingly. This class of cases will, however, embrace many different instances; some of real and primary importance, some in which the sense will be but little affected, when the error, grammatically great as it really may be, is removed, and the true rendering substituted. For instance, we shall have in the class we are now considering passages in which the error is one of a *doctrinal* nature, or, to use the most guarded language, involves some degree of liability to doctrinal misconception. For such passages we have not so far to go as it is popularly supposed. Take such a passage as Rom. v., 15, 17, where, as Bentley observed long ago,* the neglect of the articles in the original has not only obscured the sense and weakened the antithesis, but has left an opening for inferences on redemption and reprobation which, to say the least, are not substantiated by this passage. Take again such a passage as 1 Cor. xi., 29, where, if we do not go the full length of attributing definite error to the translation, we have, at any rate, a rendering of κρῖμα which, combined with the intruded ἀναξίως, has produced an influence on thousands, and even tens of thousands, of a very unhappy kind. We must add to such a list Heb. x., 38, where the words inserted in the Authorized Version, to say the very least, have nothing whatever to correspond with them in the original. We may also name Acts ii., 47, where, confessedly hard as it may be to express τοὺς σωζομένους ("those who were being saved") in an easy and idiomatic translation, faithfulness requires that we should change a rendering which not only leads to a doctrinal inference not warranted by the tense, but obscures the true and almost technical meaning which

Passages involving doctrinal error.

* The passage will be found in Bentley's *Sermon upon Popery* (Works, vol. iii., p. 245), and in Trench, *Revision of Auth. Vers.*, p. 88 seq., where it is quoted at full length.

this important expression constantly maintains in passages of profound doctrinal import, *e. g.*, Luke xiii., 23. In a passage confessedly of great difficulty as to its exact reference, viz., Col. ii., 15, the mistranslation of ἀπεκδυσάμενος has at any rate put wholly out of sight the mysterious connection which this passage seems to have with the closing hours of our Lord's earthly life, and the deep significance of some incidents in the awful scene on Golgotha. We have before alluded to John x., 16, where we can certainly draw no inference as to the oneness of the "fold," and where the present translation might seem to lead to this unauthorized inference.

We might easily continue this list, but as it is not our object to enumerate, but rather to illustrate, it may be enough to have called attention to the fact that, in spite of the very common assumption to the contrary, there *are* many passages from which erroneous doctrinal inferences have been drawn, but where the inference comes from the translation, and not the original.

Errors of less importance.

The list of actual and definite errors of a less important kind is very large. In the majority of such cases it may be admitted that Christian life and practice neither is nor has been ever affected in the slightest degree by the existence of these errors. For instance, if we give the proper translation of ἴδετε in Gal. vi., 11, of ἐυλίζοντες in Matt. xxiii., 24 (unless, indeed, this be due to the printer), of Καναανίτης in Matt. x., 4 (comp. Mark iii., 18), of διαμεριζόμεναι in Acts ii., 3, of εἴδους in 1 Thess. v., 22, of πώρωσις in Eph. iv., 18, of φαίνεσθε in Phil. ii., 15, and even of σπεύδοντας in 2 Pet. iii., 12, we contribute to the general faithfulness and accuracy of our version, but add nothing to what could be considered of serious moment. As far as the general reader is concerned, the true or the erroneous rendering might nearly equally well hold its place in the English text, and this remark is often used as an argument for leaving things alone. But the remark is equally available for the contrary course: if the removal of errors would so little affect the general reader, sure-

ly it is all the more the duty of faithfulness to the message of inspiration to transmit it to the English hearer free from incorrectness and error, *on pure principle;* and the more so, as there is no reasonable probability that even what might be called prejudiced attachment to our version as it stands would in any way be weakened by the change. It would be counted so small as to be to the general reader not a matter of conscience, but of indifference.

We may then, perhaps, fairly conclude that all *errors*, whether of the first or second class of those enumerated, or, indeed, of any class, should be removed, and it may be said with all loyalty to our Authorized Version, but yet with all truth, that these errors will be found to be by no means few in number.

Removal of inaccuracies requires much consideration.

When we come to the more subdued shade of error that may be expressed for convenience by the word *inaccuracy* or *inexactness*, it becomes much more difficult to decide on the limits to which revision should extend. If the principle of faithfulness to God's truth move us, on the one hand, to correct wherever the English Version does not accurately convey the meaning or shade of meaning of the original, we yet have, on the other hand, two countervailing considerations which must weigh seriously with every sober thinker. *First*, it must be remembered that to countless thousands the *English* Bible is the Book of Life. To them it is as though God had vouchsafed thus to communicate with man from the first: it is a positive effort to them to feel and believe that the familiar words, as they meet the eye or fall on the ear, did not thus for the first time issue from the lips of patriarch or prophet; nay, that the touching cadences in the Gospels were not originally so modulated by the tender and sympathizing voice of our own adorable Master. We have heard even of sermons in which such thoughts have unconsciously bewrayed themselves, and believe that at this moment there are numbers of earnest people who could easily be carried away by

their deeper feelings, almost at any moment, into a thorough sympathy with appeals to the familiar language of their cherished English Testament, and who, when reminded of the actual facts, would with a sigh awaken from the happy illusion, and avow their reluctance to part with this *mentis gratissimus error*. Are we to have no sympathy for this large class? Is there not something in the heart-affection for the "dear old English Bible" that deserves the respect even of the scholar and the theologian? Child-like faith is very blessed; let us run the risk of being called sentimental or quixotic rather than needlessly offend one of these little ones that thus believe in His Word and in Him.

*Secondly*, it must not be forgotten that the effort to be accurate often involves some sacrifice of the idiomatic turn and rhythmic flow of the English, and that the gain in exactness has often to be purchased at a price which even the most devoted scholar might, on consideration, hesitate to pay. The different idioms of the two languages, the parallelism rather than coincidence in respect of tenses, the much less logical use of particles in our own language than in Greek, the different principles of order and emphasis—all these things really do often make accuracy only attainable on terms which are beyond our means, and which would, in fact, be inconsistent with the ground-principles of a version which is to be read *publicly* as well as privately, and is to be idiomatic as well as exact. How often it must have happened to many a one whose eyes may fall on these lines, to have made a verbal correction in our version which, at the time, seemed not only certain, but a clear contextual improvement, and then, after an interval, to have read it over again, and come to the candid opinion that it was an *over-correction*, and, by being so, was really less faithful to the tone of the original than that which it had displaced. This consideration is really one of very great importance, for it reaches to that very difficult question of the limits to which, in translation, a language may be stretched without losing its idiomatic vigor and elasticity.

Limitations in corrections of this nature.

But are we then to attempt nothing in the way of securing greater accuracy in the English Version? Is it not one of the most certain facts in the world that it is in the matter of technical exactness and grammatical accuracy that our version is most open to adverse comment? After what we have already seen of the characteristics and pedigree of our version, it would not be natural to expect that it could be otherwise. It is substantially a version made by one faithful man long ago, under circumstances of varying trial, revised partially at intervals, and only thoroughly revised two hundred and sixty years ago. Great advances in accuracy of scholarship have been made since that last revision, and modern eyes detect many things that were not observed then. Are not many needful distinctions effaced? Is there not far too much license in the use of English synonyms when it is the same Greek word and a similar context? Are there not very many cases in which the force of the article is missed? Are not important shades of meaning conveyed by the tenses of the original, as, for example, the imperfect and the preterperfect, often quite needlessly obliterated? Is there not often inaccuracy in the translation of the prepositions, and sometimes even in passages of some little doctrinal importance? Is there not, occasionally at least, an instance to be found in which the logical connection of a passage has suffered by a loose translation of a leading particle? Certainly: all this may be safely and frankly admitted; the careful comparison of any single chapter of moderate length with the Greek would show the justice of probably every one of the foregoing queries. We do not give instances simply because they can be found in any handbook,* and because it is really difficult, with so large a choice,

* We may refer especially to Abp. Trench *On the Revision of the Authorized Version*, chap. iv., v., vii., viii., ix., where numerous examples will be found of inaccuracies and questionable renderings. The *Hints for an Improved Translation* of the late Professor Scholefield will also supply many instances. We still, however, need a careful work in which the errors, inaccuracies, and doubtful renderings in the Authorized Version might be ar-

to make a sufficiently wide and inclusive selection. Well, then, what are we to do in such cases? Up to what limits are we to carry revision in the particular case of *inaccuracy*, and yet retain that principle of least possible alteration which is the only principle on which any successful revision could be made? . . . . . The foregoing paragraphs have perhaps tended to supply the true answer: Inaccuracies, *about which there is no reasonable doubt*, may be beneficially corrected, subject to the following limitations, viz., that the idiom of the language is not affected by the change; that the change does not introduce more than is implied in the original, and is, in fact, an over-correction; that the tone of the clause or sentence, and the familiar rhythm, are not seriously interfered with; and, lastly, that the character of the passage and its associations are not such that the correction of the local inaccuracy might weaken the general reader's real appreciation of the tenor of the whole passage. This last restriction is of importance, as it often happens that a correction of some inaccuracy of detail mars in some subtle manner the balance of the whole clause, and ultimately really introduces more inaccuracy in our general perception of its tenor and sentiment than has been removed by the alteration. In a word, the *tone* of the passage has been injured, and the change in the part has interfered with the harmony of the whole.

If these restrictions, which we have studiously stated in negative clauses, are carefully observed, it would not seem imprudent to extend revision to indisputable *inaccuracies*. It is clear, however, that no rules or restrictions will be sufficient to apply to all the really numberless cases that will come under the observation of the reviser. Tact and experience, and, let us not forget to add, a careful imitation of the manner in which the revisers of 1611 acted, in respect of in-

ranged on some scholarly and logical principle. Newcome's fifteen rules are made the heads under which some useful examples are grouped by a writer in the *Westminster Review* for Jan., 1857, p. 141 seq. These rules, however, require much modification.

exactness, toward the Bishops' Bible (a truly admirable portion of their work), will be found to do more for us than all rules. We may, however, pause for a page or two to give a few examples, some of inaccuracies which might be beneficially removed, and some of cases where, for one or more of the restrictions above alluded to, it might seem best to leave the passage alone.

It is really difficult to know how to make a selection; but let us take first that large class of cases where a genitive of *quality* is found in the original, and where in our version an adjective is used. In such a passage as Phil. iii., 21, it seems quite clear that "the body of our vileness" and "the body of his glory" would be more truthful and forcible than "our vile body" and "his glorious body," as we now have it in our English Version. It would be consistent, too, with the general principle of our version, in which the instances are numerous where the adjectival translation of the older versions is removed for the more vigorous and expressive genitive. Thus, in Eph. i., 18, "the riches of his glorious inheritance" of Tyndale and the Genevan Testament rightly passes under the discriminating hand of the last revisers into the familiar "riches of the glory of his inheritance;" and the even more familiar "mammon of unrighteousness," in Luke xvi., 9, is the wise change from the "wicked mammon" of Tyndale, and the "unrighteous mammon" of Cranmer. At the same time, it would be hardly advisable to change in the very same parable, and only one verse before, "the unjust steward" into "the steward of injustice" or "the steward of unrighteousness," though it is certainly grammatically true that the genitive is a genitive of *quality*, and does very distinctly serve to mark that ἀδικία was the ruling principle of the man's wretched life. Tact is here our only guide.

Examples of inaccuracies. Genitive of quality.

Again, can we be sufficiently thankful that our last revisers fell back on the rendering of Coverdale in 2 Thess. ii., 3, "the man of sin," rather than "the sinful man" of Tyndale and all

the earlier versions except the Rhemish? though, by the way, a little lower down, in ver. 7, we may reasonably express regret that they did not maintain the true meaning of *ἀνομία*. "Lawlessness" is to be the essential character of Antichrist, and is a part of the mystery which was showing itself even in the apostle's day, and is now so ominously developing itself in our own.

We should, then, only be following the precedent of our own version if in many passages, such as Rom. viii., 21, 2 Cor. iv., 4 (Cranmer keeps the genitive), Col. i., 13, 1 Pet. i., 14 (contrast the rendering in Eph. ii., 2), 2 Pet. ii., 14, al., we introduce the strong and expressive genitive of the original Greek.

In the tenses, the cases of inaccuracy are very numerous; but here again considerable caution and a due observance of the restrictions above alluded to will be found especially needed. In the imperfect, for instance, there are several passages in which a strict translation is absolutely required by the circumstances, but there are also very many more in which the flow of the English Version would be impeded, and the general aspect of the action described unduly emphasized, if the more literal translation was introduced. For example, in Luke v., 6, *διερήγνυτο* clearly ought to be translated "was breaking," or was "beginning to break;" but if, a few verses lower, we adopted the same sort of rendering in the case of *διήρχετο* and *συνήρχοντο* (ver. 15), we should not only be overdoing the translation, but precluding ourselves from marking by a special change of diction in the next verse the *ἦν ὑποχωρῶν. . . . . καὶ προσευχόμενος*, where the resolved form would really seem to have been designed by the evangelist to express more strongly than the ordinary imperfect the continuance, and, for the time, the habitual character of the action.*

Tenses.

* Two of the earlier translators mark the change of diction, and the apparent specification of the continuance of the act, by the translation, "And he kepte him silfe apart" (Tyndale), "and he kepte him silfe out of the way"

In the translation of the prepositions many wise changes might be made, some of them of real interest and importance. For instance, in Gal. iii., 19, much of a doctrinal nature is involved in the translation we assign to the quasi-preposition χάριν, while in the last clause of the same verse a really historical fact seems brought out by observing the true force of διά with the genitive; angels were the intermediate agencies by which the law was ordained on Sinai. As Theodoret remarks, they were present and assistants at the solemn scene. Again, in 2 Pet. i., 5–7, the ethical relation of the substantives to each other is quite effaced by the translation unfortunately adopted in the Authorized Version: the development of Christian graces the one from the other is exquisitely marked in the pregnant and inclusive ἐν of the original, and is, to a great degree, preserved in the simple and usual translation of the preposition as rightly preserved by Tyndale and Cranmer. But here again caution will be necessary, and a due observance not merely of technical identity of language, but of the tenor of the passage; as, for example, though the significant use of the preposition εἰς is rightly preserved by the A.V. in the translation of Gal. iii., 27, εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, it is abundantly clear that such a translation would be very inappropriate in 1 Cor. x., 2, εἰς τὸν Μοϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο, where our own version, by its happy choice of "unto," at once relieves us from the somewhat awkward "under" of Tyndale, and at the same time marks the essential difference between a baptism unto Moses and baptism *into* the mystical body of Christ.

Prepositions.

In the case of particles, numerous instances could be given, especially in St. Paul's Epistles, where the whole reasoning of a passage is brought out by a careful observance

Particles.

(Cranmer). As a general rule, it would seem desirable, where some latent meaning is *really* brought out by such a change, to make it, especially as we have the authority of the early versions, but it would be a rule with many exceptions. For instance, in Gal. i., 22, we might perhaps tolerate "I remained unknown" as marking the continuance of the state, but in ver. 23 ἀκούοντες ἦσαν could hardly be translated otherwise than "they heard."

of the use of the illative and argumentative ἄρα or ἄρ' οὖν rather than of the lighter and consequence-suggesting οὖν; but even here caution must be used, and a very close regard paid to the tenor of the passage before we introduce alterations; this simple fact being enough at once to warn us that St. Paul uses the simpler οὖν at least four times as often as he uses ἄρα, and that St. John, in all his writings, never uses the latter particle once, though he uses οὖν considerably more than 200 times. The same caution in not *over-pressing* will be found necessary in reference to most of the other particles used in the New Testament. In the majority of cases the general force of the particles has been observed in our Authorized Version, if not on principles of strict grammatical precision, yet with an instinctive feeling for their essential meanings, which has often led to singularly happy renderings. Still the cases are numerous in which a guarded change will bring out latent meanings that may have escaped the attention even of observant readers of Scripture. To take a final instance: we seem fairly justified in giving to the ἀλλά at the beginning of John xix., 34, its stronger adversative force, even though a negative, which usually somewhat modifies this force, is found in the preceding clause. If, then, we turn the lighter and here somewhat trivial "but" into the stronger "howbeit," we just call up the interesting thought that, though the holy body was to all appearance dead, yet that, to make it certain, the Roman soldier had thrust his spear into the sacred side, and shown something like the same rough instinctive mercy which had been shown three or four hours before (ver. 29, compared with Matt. xxvii., 48), perhaps by the same hand. While, however, such a change may perhaps be made in this particular instance, it would be undesirable to adopt such a translation, say in chap. xv., 25, or any similar passage, where the lighter shade of the meaning is, in English at least, more natural.

We have mentioned a few instances, but the cases in which greater accuracy might be attained without the least shock

to the general reader, and without in any degree affecting the flow of the English, are really very numerous. We have that large class of cases in which nouns stand under the vinculum of a single preposition, and where the interpolation in English of the second preposition really sometimes gives a tinge of meaning which is not in the Greek. We have that very interesting class of cases which fall under what is technically called Granville Sharpe's rule, where two substantives are similarly under the vinculum of a common article, and where the incorrect interpolation of it in English may, in some few great passages like Tit. ii., 13, really weaken the authority of a weighty witness to a catholic truth.

Words under vinculum of a prep. or article.

The cases, again, in which the force of the article is neglected, or in which it is needlessly and even erroneously inserted, are especially numerous. In some of these we really sometimes obscure a truth of deep interest and importance. Let 1 Thess. iv., 17 be an instance. Here, by the translation "in the clouds," when it ought to be simply "in clouds," we mar the whole wondrous picture. The first translation would make it simply a being caught up to the clouds above, whereas the true translation suggests the idea of the clouds mysteriously enwreathing and bearing upward each company of the faithful, and of the holy living rising from earth as their Master rose, when the "cloud received him out of their sight."

Article.

Lastly, when we take into consideration the number of passages in which individual words have been inaccurately translated, and either some doctrine affected (*e. g.*, λουτροῦ, Tit. iii., 5, "laver," not "washing"),*

Individual words.

* In this particular instance our venerable version would seem to present some trace of doctrinal bias. Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Genevan Version all properly recognize the purely concrete nature of the term λουτρόν (see, in reference to the termination, Bopp, *Vergleichende Grammatik*, § 815, vol. iii., p. 195; Donaldson, *Cratylus*, § 267, p. 473), and give to the word, at any rate, an approximately correct translation "fountayne (of the newe birth"). The Rhemish, following the Vulgate, gives the more exact "laver." The

some important fact obscured (*e. g.*, φανερωθῆναι, 2 Cor. v., 10: every man will "be made manifest," and laid bare, as well as "appear" before the Judge), some unwelcome idea called up (as, for example, by the translation of ζῶα in Rev. iv., 6, al., especially when θηρίον occurs so often and in such an utterly different sense), or some striking imagery obliterated (*e. g.*, ἀσπασάμενον, Heb. xi., 13; they were far from having "embraced" them: as Tyndale and Cranmer rightly mark in translation, they did but "salute" them from afar)—when we take all these numerous isolated cases, as well as the classes of instances which we have before specified, it seems impossible to resist the conviction that revision ought certainly to extend to cases of *inaccuracy*, but that it also ought to be subjected to restrictions, and that each individual case should be estimated on its own merits.

Insufficient renderings.

Besides cases of definite inaccuracy, we have a large class of cases in which our translation is *insufficient* and inadequate rather than positively inaccurate or inexact. Here the same rules mainly apply as stated above; but still greater care is required, otherwise the whole texture of our version might be insensibly altered. Indeed, it may perhaps be safely said that if a case does not come clearly under the head of a definite inaccuracy it should be left untouched. We want a revised, not what is ambitiously called an improved translation.

Debatable passages.

Similar care will have to be used in reference to *debatable* passages. Where the balance of opinion either way is nearly the same, there prudence suggests that the present English Version should obviously be allowed to remain. Even in important passages, such as Phil. ii., 6, where the judgment of modern criticism seems clearly to preponderate against the rendering of ἁρπαγμόν, adopted by the older versions and retained by the A. V., we should yet consider it questionable whether any change should be intro-

translation "washing" would seem to have been introduced by the translators from Wicliffe.

duced. The same may be said of the interesting and difficult passage, Rom. viii., 20, 21, where, though it does seem required by the general tenor of the passage that the ὅτι should be regarded as closely dependent on the preceding ἐλπίδι ("in hope that," etc.) rather than as causal and commencing a new clause, we should still hesitate before we made the change. Even in a yet clearer case, where there does seem something like inaccuracy, and where a change would certainly seem to cast some feeble light on the exegetical difficulty, we should hesitate before we actually substituted "inasmuch as they were disobedient" for the "who were disobedient" of the A.V. in the celebrated passage 1 Pet. iii., 20. The grammatical certainty of the clear difference in thought between a participle with and without the article would weigh much with us, still, even here we might not feel a case strong enough for an absolute change. In regard of the translation of πνεύματι in verse 18 we should not be so sensitive, as here the insertion of the τῷ is clearly against evidence, and the translation would have to follow the true text. In all such debatable passages, then, prudence would seem to suggest the maintenance of the present version, though the alternative rendering might most properly be placed in the margin. And if in these greater passages, so, certainly, would it seem desirable to leave the text untouched in passages of minor importance, such, for example, as Luke ii., 49, ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Πατρός μου (house, or things?), John v., 39, ἐρευνᾶτε (present, or imperative?), John xii., 6, ἐβάσταζεν (bare, or purloined?), Col. i., 15, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως ("of every creature," or "before every creature?"). In all such passages, where the arguments are nearly in equipoise, conservative principles might judiciously be allowed to prevail.

Inconsistency of renderings.

But in passages where there is an *inconsistency* of rendering, it would seem proper to act with greater freedom. While we may rightly recognize and maintain the general principle of our own version, and, indeed, of some of the earlier versions, viz., in preserving a free-

dom as to the rendering of the same Greek word, we can hardly defend the varied translations of the same words that are found in our version of the Synoptical Gospels. There is certainly force in the remark of Archbishop Trench, that, in cases of similarity of language in the Greek, as, for instance, in the case of the Epistle to the Ephesians and the Epistle to the Colossians, a careful version ought in some degree to reproduce the interesting phenomenon of the similarity of words and expressions in the original.* Here, then, there really seems valid reason for a reconsideration of the great variety of rendering which we find in the Authorized Version, and for the belief that not only in these more general instances, but in the case of particular words, much improvement might properly be introduced. No plea for freedom can fully justify us in retaining all the seventeen different renderings of *καταργέω*, when the word itself is only used about twenty-seven times in all, or the nine different renderings of *ζηλόω* out of a total of twelve passages; and that these are not isolated or extreme cases will be seen by any one who will take the trouble to examine the various translations that are given to almost any word of fairly common use in the Greek Testament. We advise any one who may feel a doubt on this subject to look into a useful work called *The Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament*, and to judge for himself.† Here, at any rate, revision would be not only

* See *Rev. of Authorized Version*, p. 59, where examples are given of needless changes in rendering in the case of some words common to the Epistle to the Ephesians and Epistle to the Colossians—*e. g.*, *ἐνέργεια*, Eph. i., 19, Col. ii., 12; *ταπεινοφροσύνη*, Eph. iv., 2, Col. iii., 12; *συμβιβαζόμενον*, Eph. iv., 16, Col. ii., 19. To which we may add *ἀσέλγεια*, 2 Pet. ii., 7, Jude 4; *κυριότης*, 2 Pet. ii., 10, Jude 8 (the margin of the former passage, however, gives also "dominion," as in the latter passage); and the really perverse change of rendering in *ζόφος*, 2 Pet. ii., 17, Jude 13, and that in a clause where to the extent of eight continuous words St. Peter and St. Jude are absolutely identical. These are cases in which, with the greatest desire to make as few changes as possible, hardly any reviser could forbear suggesting a change in one of the two synonyms thus found in identical passages.

† This useful work is better known to scholars and interpreters than to the general student. It had, however, reached a third edition in 1860. The

desirable, but necessary. Yet here also caution would be required. No mere mechanical uniformity of translation is for one moment to be advocated. The word that most faithfully represents the meaning of the passage under consideration is the word to be used and to be maintained, without any reference to the mere fact of its having been used or not having been used in other passages where the same Greek word may have occurred. Where, however, not only the Greek word is the same, but the tenor and context of the passage is the same, there variation is not only undesirable, but even unfaithful. It is only, then, in clear cases that this form of revision should be applied, but there it should be applied without hesitation.

Obscure renderings.

The last class of cases in which revision seems necessary is where we find *obscurity*, whether due to the now antiquated meaning of the English words, or to the difficulty or ambiguity of the original Greek.

There are a few cases of the latter kind in which the revisers of 1611 seem to have studiously left the difficulty as they found it, and to have made the English only too faithful a rendering of the Greek.* Such a verse, for instance, as

plan of the work is very simple. The Greek word is given, and under it the passages where it is used; but the passages so cited are not, as in Bruder's *Concordance*, in Greek, but in English, and in the words of the Authorized Version. The student can thus see at a glance not only how many times a word is used in the original, but how it is translated in each passage. The judgment that a sober inspection of this volume would lead to would seem to be this—that, as a general rule, the variations of rendering in our version are certainly numerous, and even in excess; but that, in the great majority of cases, the meaning directly or indirectly conveyed by the context has been felt and recognized, and the English word chosen accordingly.

* It is very doubtful how far such a principle as this can be justified, viz., of leaving the English translation in the same state of ambiguity as the Greek, so that, if two meanings should be fairly compatible with the words of the original, they should be equally so with the words of the translation. It may be urged that it is literally faithful; but, on the other hand, it must be felt to be an evasion. Let us take an instance. In the very doubtful words, John i., 9, *ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον*, there are obviously three constructions possible. Either *ἐρχόμενον* may be joined (1) with *ἦν* as a sort of resolved imperfect, or (2)

verse 36 of 1 Cor. vii., can hardly convey any meaning whatever to the English reader, whereas by the simple insertion of the word "daughter" in italics after the word "virgin" some clew to the meaning of the verse is at once given. Col. ii., 23 is perhaps another instance. In such cases, however, two good rules must be systematically followed. First, the translator must be careful not to pass into the province of the interpreter, and to give a paraphrase instead of a faithful rendering. All that he can or ought to do is, by some words in italics, or some happy choice of expression or subtle change of collocation, to make the probable meaning of the Greek as clear and appreciable as the nature of the passage will admit. Secondly, if there be difference of opinion as to the meaning of the words, one or more of the alternative renderings should be placed in the margin.

Archaisms, if obscure, should be removed.

In the case of *archaisms* which tend to obscure the meaning, revision should certainly be adopted. But here this very obvious rule should be followed: archaisms should be removed, not wherever they occur, simply because they *are* archaisms, but in those cases only where they leave the general reader in doubt as to the meaning of the words or passage. For instance, few general readers or hearers know what St. Paul means when he tells the Corinthians that he knows "nothing by himself" (1 Cor. iv., 4), or

with ἄνθρωπον as a tertiary predicate (see Donaldson, *Greek Grammar*, § 489 seq.), or (3) with φῶς as a secondary predicate (see Donaldson, *New Cratylus*, § 304, or *Greek Grammar*, § 436 seq.). Assuming—which may be assumed—that the choice mainly lies between (2) and (3), are we to adopt a translation which would leave the English as doubtful as to structure as the Greek, *e. g.*, "every man coming into the world" (so the *Five Clergymen*), or are we to make the meaning distinct by translating either according to (2), "when he cometh into the world" (the A.V. is inexact), or according to (3), "by coming into the world"—"*i. e.*, by the Word's coming into the world?" The answer is not easy. The decision, however, of most interpreters would, we think, be this: Do not adopt the evasive translation, but place one of the two latter translations in the text and the other in the margin. The result in this individual case would probably be that (3) would obtain the place in the text, and that (2) would stand in the margin. To evade is never satisfactory.

would suppose that the words in the Greek were *οὐδὲν ἐμαυτῷ σύνοιδα*. Here a change of preposition ("against" for "by") would be quite enough, without turning for aid to the wordy "I am not guilty in conscience of any thing" of the Rhemish Version. The "by myself" is found in all the old versions, and is an heir-loom from Tyndale. It would still be understood in some parts of England, but is certainly misunderstood by the majority of English readers. The often-quoted "took up our carriages" of Acts xxi., 15 is another instance. Here the archaism has no such pedigree as the former, but was due to the last revision: Tyndale's rendering is "we made ourselves ready," which under Coverdale's hand became the very vague "were ready." Cranmer, followed by the Bishops' Bible, adopts the not very felicitous "we took up our burdens;" the Genevan the more exact but certainly homely "we trussed up our fardels;" while the Rhemish comes very badly out of it with the frigid and scarcely accurate "being prepared," due to the "præparati" of the Vulgate. Tyndale's rendering is really, perhaps, the best of those already given, and has on its side, what perhaps its author was little aware of, the authority of the venerable Syriac Version. Many similar instances might be cited, such, for example, as Matt. vi., 25, "take no thought;" Acts xvii., 23, "devotions;" 1 Tim. v., 4, "nephews;" in all of which change is clearly required, owing to the change of meaning which the lapse of time has introduced into the words. It may be doubted, also, whether a passage which a few years ago was quoted in the House of Commons* as a mistranslation, "not slothful in business" (Rom. xii., 11), does not really involve an archaism, and whether the "busyness" of 1611 did not approach more nearly to the *σπουδῇ* of the original than it certainly does now. There is a little doubt, however, in the

* This particular passage was referred to by Mr. Heywood in his speech on Revision when moving the address above referred to (see p. 14), and cited as being erroneously translated. See the speech as given in *Hansard's Debates* (3d Series), vol. cxliii., p. 122 seq.

matter, as Tyndale, by his "let not the business which ye have in hand be tedious to you," though showing praiseworthy exactness as to the article (*τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροί*), has apparently used "business" in the sense in which it is now used, and which a popular preacher on this sermon found to his cost was certainly not the sense which St. Paul intended to be assigned to it in his practical and ever-seasonable precept. Love and zeal in the hearts of the very best of us are ever in danger of growing dull and cold.

Concluding remarks.

We have now concluded our general survey of the limits to which revision might properly be carried. We have seen that not only where error is plainly to be recognized, but even in cases where inaccuracy, inconsistency, or obscurity may be distinctly visible, there it would seem the duty of a faithful revision to introduce corrections. There may be also other cases hardly falling exactly under any one of the classes just specified where an attentive reviser might feel that a change was necessary to bring out the full meaning of the holy original, but these probably would not be many, and, when the great principle of *the least possible change consistent with faithfulness* was borne in mind, would often be reconsidered on a final review. We may fairly assume, then, that we have specified the limits beyond which no revision of the future would ever be likely to go, and to which, if the revision were undertaken by authority, it ought certainly to be restrained by definite preliminary instructions.

Into the minor matters of the spelling of proper names, correction of doubtful English (Matt. xvi., 15; John ix., 31, al.), use of italics (Col. i., 19; Heb. x., 38, al.), punctuation (1 Cor. xv., 29, 32; 2 Cor. v., 19, al.), and other matters of detail, it does not seem here necessary to enter.* In all, the same

* All these questions, however, are of importance, especially the introduction of italics and punctuation. In regard to the former, a very careful inquiry would have to be instituted as to what are to be considered *the* italics of the Authorized Version, if, indeed, the "previous question" would not have

general principles of restriction above alluded to would commonly be found applicable, but as the likelihood of disturbing existing prepossessions by such changes would be but small, the restrictive principle would not need to be very rigorously applied. Perhaps we may shortly say that on the first of the cases above-mentioned (spelling of proper names) but little change would be desirable, but that in the last (punctuation) considerable improvements might be introduced. Even here, however, caution would be required. Punctuation is not by any means in so satisfactory a state, even in our modern historical works, that we could presume overmuch on modern theories. Under any circumstance, it is to be hoped that no toleration would be extended to that objectionable, though, as we fear our own pages bear witness, occasionally serviceable modern mark, the dash. The revisers, we think, would be wise to make the Cambridge edition their standard, and to adhere to its punctuation, unless the exegesis of the passage clearly required a change.

We may now pass onward to the actual application of the principles above laid down.

to be raised as to whether they might not be dispensed with altogether. The edition of 1611 has never been held to be a valid authority, many instances occurring in which supplementary words are inserted, and not, as usually, printed in italics: see, for example, Gal. i., 8, 9, where there is a distinct inconsistency in printing ("preach *any other Gospel*") in two consecutive verses. There appears to have been a thorough revision of these additions in the Cambridge folio edition of 1638. Between that time and 1769 many additions seem to have crept in, but since the latter date, when the italics were again revised, few, if any, fresh introductions appear to have been made. In a few passages (*e. g.*, Acts vii., 9, "calling upon *God*") it may be doubted whether the gloss supplied by the added word is not exegetically incorrect. In the equally important question of punctuation there would be need of careful preliminary consideration. In many passages (*e. g.*, 1 Cor. xv., 29, 32; 2 Cor. v., 19) the punctuation depends on previous exegetical decision. A careful paper on this subject will be found in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for Oct., 1868. The fullest information on the subject of italics will be found in an excellent treatise by the late Bishop of Ely (Dr. Turton), entitled *The Text of the English Bible as printed at the Universities*, Cambridge, 1833.

## CHAPTER V.

### AMOUNT OF CORRECTIONS LIKELY TO BE INTRODUCED.

Amount of change an important question.

We have now come to a very practical question, and one that can only be satisfactorily answered in a practical manner, and by actual samples of revision in accordance with the foregoing rules. It is, indeed, a question of primary importance. If it should appear that the amount of change necessary to bring our present version up to a reasonable standard of faithfulness and accuracy is really not so great as is assumed by popular writers and thinkers on the subject, then much of the prejudice against a revision would disappear. The question, in fact, would then not assume the invidious form, Is it wise to tamper with our existing noble version? but would simply be this: With such an amount of change before us as the foregoing principles would seem to involve, is it wise or unwise to disturb our existing translation? On the amount of change the whole subject will mainly be found to turn, and till that be approximately estimated all dealing with current objections will be futile. Our present opponents—even those, it may be said, who at least ought to be better informed, at once assume that there *will be* a great amount, and then proceed to state all the evils that will follow.

How it may be ascertained.

We must, then, deal with the question, however roughly, of probable amount. But how can this best be done? Probably in two ways: First, as in the case of the amount of change likely to be introduced by grammatical and exegetical considerations, by taking some current revision made on general principles of distinct avoidance of change except where accuracy required it, and by making a calculation from actual inspection of the sum total

of corrections that would be likely on such a system to be introduced in the whole of the New Testament. Secondly, by giving actual samples of revision, based on the principles of the foregoing chapter, and checked by all the limitations which we have already specified. We shall then have before us a system in which generally unnecessary change is avoided, and also one in which limiting and conservative considerations are still more allowed to prevail.

Amount of change in the revision of the Five Clergymen.

For a rough estimate of the greatest amount of change that it would seem reasonable to expect in any revision of the present day, we may turn to one already used in reference to textual change, *The Revised Translation by Five Clergymen.* In this work, though change has been very freely introduced wherever faithfulness and accuracy seemed to require it, yet it certainly may be considered as a fair specimen of a revision in which unnecessary change is avoided. The amount of change is greater, especially in the case of inaccuracies, than would result from an observance of the principles of this chapter, as scarcely any instance, however slight, has been allowed to pass without emendation. If, then, we first make our calculation from this particular translation, we shall probably have arrived at results, as to the amount of change, beyond which it may be considered certain that no careful and conservative revision of the present time would ever advance. We shall, in fact, have arrived at what mathematicians call the superior limit, the inferior limit being either change only where it would simply be *impossible*, on any principle of faithfulness, to maintain the present version, or no change at all.

Let us take two different portions, one from the Gospels, the other from the Epistles, so as to form as fair an estimate as we can for the whole of the New Testament. If we take the first four chapters of St. John's Gospel and count all the changes (except those due to textual criticism, which have been estimated already), we shall find that they amount to about 172. The majority of these changes, however, is of so

slight a kind as regards the general tone and rhythm of the verse (insertions of the article, changes of perfect to the simple preterite, etc.) that they would probably escape the notice of the general hearer. The number of verses in the four chapters is 166.

If we now take a short epistle, St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, and similarly count the changes, we shall find them about 167, the number of verses being 149. If we now combine the results so as to form a rough estimate for the whole New Testament, this result is arrived at—about 339 changes in 315 verses, or very little more, on the average, than at the rate of *one change for each verse.* Such a result can not fairly be considered very alarming when we remember that this amounts, on an average, to a change of a single word in certainly not less than every twenty. At any rate, even if it should seem alarming,* it may be considered sufficient to dispose of the greater part of the current arguments against revision, which are founded on the assumption of a far greater

* It is worthy of notice, and certainly not unsatisfactory, that this amount of change has already been thought very alarming, not only by episcopal speakers in the recent sitting of Convocation (see *The Guardian* for May 11), but even in public journals, where thoroughness of work is more often recommended than purely conservative change. The fears, however, are not altogether well founded. In the first place, it may be said that no present revision for *public use* would be likely to go so far as that of the *Five Clergymen*, on which the calculation was based. Still, when all the small changes, not only in the text and translation, but also in the italics and even punctuation, which would almost certainly be introduced even by the most conservative revisers, are taken into the calculation, it does not seem likely that the aggregate of changes, great *and small* (the majority will certainly be of this description), will numerically be much less than has been specified, though the whole version will be revised to a decidedly lower key than that of the *Five Clergymen*. The comparison in an article in *The Times* (for May 6) between one change in every verse and one note in every bar in a piece of music, is hardly fair. In the first place, the ratio of the one change to the average number of elements unchanged is very different in the two cases, and, in the next place, it is certainly true that we may express the same sentiment by different forms of words, whereas the same air can only be expressed by the same sequence of notes. After all, calculation will show, as is indicated in the text, that such a standard of revision will only involve change *to the amount of five per cent.* Can this be thought very serious?

percentage of change. When it is quite clear that no revision would be tolerated in excess of that of the Five Clergymen, and when cool calculation shows that in that particular revision the amount of change would appear to be about one word, and that often a little word, in each verse, surely it is idle to call this recasting or remodeling, and to argue accordingly.

It can not be pleaded that other portions of Scripture would show very different results to those derived from the portions now chosen. In St. Paul's Epistles, in the work referred to, the amount of change is very steady.

Final amount on this basis.

If the Epistle to the Hebrews had been translated, the change in it would probably have risen above the standard, but this would have been more than balanced by the smaller amount of change in other Gospels, in two of which it would have probably fallen below. If, then, we may assume that any future revision would certainly not overstep the limits practically observed in the work referred to, we arrive, for our superior limit, at this result—*one change in every five verses due to textual criticism, and about one change in each verse due to grammar and general exegesis.* But this, let it be remembered, is the superior limit, below which it is perfectly clear that any revision of the present time would certainly fall. If every petty change due to every cause were to be taken into account, the result would be as above; but, in the foregoing estimate, notice is only taken of the greater forms of change due to textual and grammatical considerations.

Probable amount in a new revision.

We have now to try and estimate how far below this superior limit any modern revision would be likely to fall. This can only be done by giving some samples of revision, textual and grammatical, based on the principles of the last chapter, as far as a single mind can do it; but it must be well borne in remembrance by the intelligent reader that he has here only the judgment of *a single mind*, and that the results would probably be different in the

case of several minds in union. The difference, however, would not, perhaps, *ultimately* be in excess. On first going over the work the amount of change would be great; but on a reconsideration of it, experience, maturity of powers, conviction of the impossibility of following rigid rules, and—best of all teachers—consciousness in many passages of failure and of over-correction, would finally reduce the changes, on the second revision, almost by one half. All united companies of revisers, whatever their work may be, commonly begin with timidity, rapidly advance to boldness and excess of change, and end with caution and conservatism. When the παλίντροπος αὔρα in revision, as the Greeks call it, once begins to blow, it continues with all the steadiness of a trade wind. It does not, then, by any means follow that a mixed company of revisers would introduce in the long run more changes in actual amount than any one single scholar of moderation and sobriety. The changes introduced by the company would undoubtedly be better than those of the individual, but they would not be more numerous.

Sample portions chosen for revision.

The portions of Scripture chosen are the Sermon on the Mount, and four of the most difficult chapters of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans: the first as being a portion of Scripture in which the change needed is very little, the second as being a portion where necessary change reaches a maximum. Except in cases where the reason for the change is obvious, the principles on which it is made are shortly specified in the foot-notes. The changes due to textual criticism are indicated by spaced printing, and the reading of the Authorized Version given in the left-hand margin; the changes due to grammar and other principles are indicated by blacker type, and the words which have been affected by the changes are given in the right-hand column. The amount, as well as the nature of the changes, can thus easily be seen. It may be added that italics are left as we find them in what may be called (for these added words) the first really standard edition (Cambridge, 1638).

We begin, then, with our blessed Lord's Sermon on the Mount.

ST. MATTHEW, CHAP. V.

CRITICAL. 1 And seeing the multitudes, he went up into **the*** mountain: and a when he was set, his disciples came unto him. 2 And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying, 3 Blessed *are* the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. 4 Blessed *are* they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.† 5 Blessed *are* the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. 6 Blessed *are* they **that**‡ hunger and which do thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled. 7 Blessed *are* the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy. 8 Blessed *are* the poor in heart: for they shall see God. 9 Blessed *are* the GRAMMATICAL.

* Here a change seems positively required, not merely on grammatical grounds, but on general and exegetical grounds. It was "*the* mountain," not necessarily "the known mountain" (De Wette), but simply the mountain near to which and on the sides of which the multitudes then were gathered; *τὸ ὄρος τὸ πλησίον*, Euthymius. The article is *certainly* not used indefinitely either in Greek (see Hermann, *on Viger*, p. 703) or Hebrew, and almost certainly not here generically ("the mountain country"), *ὄρος* being always used in the N. T. to denote a single mountain, and *ἡ ὀρεινὴ* (Luke i., 39, 65) the mountain-country. All the English versions adopt the indefinite article; the Anglo-Saxon, however, has properly retained the definite translation, "THone múnt." See Bosworth, *Anglo-Saxon Gospels, in loc.*, p. 16.

† This verse is placed after ver. 5 by Lachmann, Tregelles, and other editors on the authority of the Codex Bezæ, the Curetonian Syriac, and a definite comment of Origen; but it is almost certain that the authority would be considered by all sober critics as far too weak to justify any change.

‡ One of those *very* small changes which will often have to be made. There is really no reason, except it can possibly be that the insertion of "do" was thought to bind "hunger & thirst" more closely together, why there should be a change from the translation in ver. 4. *Tyndale, Cranmer*, and the *Genevan* similarly vary as to "which," but not as to the insertion of the "do," as in the A. V.

CRITICAL. peacemakers: for they shall be called GRAMMATICAL.
the sons* of God. 10 Blessed *are* they children
which are persecuted for righteous-
ness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom
of heaven. 11 Blessed are ye, when
men shall revile you, and persecute
*you*, and shall say all manner of evil
against you falsely,† for my sake. 12
Rejoice, and be exceeding glad,‡ for
great *is* your reward in heaven: for
so persecuted they the prophets which
were before you.

13 Ye are the salt of the earth: but
if the salt have lost his savour, where-
with shall it be salted? it is thence-
forth good for nothing, but to be cast
out, and to be trodden under foot of

* Probably a desirable change. The distinction between "children" and "sons" may usually be maintained with advantage both in this and in other passages of the New Testament. The reference, of course, is to the *νἱοθεσία*, but no argument can be founded on the general translation of this word, as it is translated in three ways in the A.V., viz., "adoption" in Rom. viii., 15, 23; "adoption of sons," Gal. iv., 5; "adoption of children," Eph. i., 5. We may remark that there is no need to displace the article, there being at least two good grammatical reasons (the nuncupative verb *κληθήσονται* and the absence of the article before *Θεοῦ*) why it should not be expressed in the original, though presumably latent. It may be added that throughout the paragraph the translation of *ὅτι* is maintained as in the A.V. No doubt *ὅτι* more commonly gives the reason ("because"), while *γὰρ* rather confirms ("for"); but to press such a principle here would be quite needless: comp. ver. 36. In ver. 12, where *ὅτι* and *γὰρ* appear together, the matter is more doubtful.

† The word "falsely" (*ψευδόμενοι*) would not appear if the translation were made from the text of Lachmann or Tischendorf (ed. 7), but its omission is very feebly supported, and could not be accepted when the evidence for and against the omission is soberly considered. Meyer is evidently influenced by purely internal and subjective considerations. These have their just weight both here and generally, but few would deem them sufficient to make up for the small amount of evidence against the word.

‡ We have placed a comma after this word for the sake of more closely connecting the clause with the words that follow, and so of thus marking the slight change of ratiocination involved in the *ὅτι* and *γὰρ*, and of avoiding the heavier "because."

CRITICAL. men. 14 Ye are the light of the world. GRAMMATICAL.
A city **set*** on an hill can not be hid. that is set
15 Neither do men light a candle, and
put it under **the†** bushel, but on **the†** a a
candlestick; and it giveth light unto
all that are in the house. 16 **Even so‡** Let your light so
let your light shine before men, that
they may see your good works, and
glorify your Father which is in heaven.

17 Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. 18 For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. 19 Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called **least§** in the the least

* The relative is here omitted with *Wicliffe*, it being really a principle of some importance to maintain, where possible, the translation of the participle when thus used without the article, and being thus what is called a secondary predication: see Donaldson, *New Cratylus*, § 301. The relatival or directly predicative translation is found in all the older versions (except *Wicliffe*), and even in Alford, *Auth. Vers. Revised* (*in loc.*), but it is not logically or grammatically correct. What our blessed Lord says is this: "A city can not be hid when it lieth on a mountain." The words that most nearly say this, with the least possible disturbance of the A.V., are those in the text. No doubt both ὄρους and κειμένη could be more literally translated, but the principle of minimum change suggests the present words.

† These two changes seem positively required, if any account is really to be taken of the article. The slight difficulty that the reader feels is not so much owing to the translation as to the fact that a bushel is not one of those articles which are commonly found in houses now.

‡ The correction is really required for perspicuity. Nine English readers out of ten think that the "so" refers to what follows, and not to what precedes. *Tyndale*, and all the later versions except the *Rhemish*, coincide with the A.V. The Anglo-Saxon and *Wicliffe* both properly throw the "so" forward, and make it the first word in the sentence.

§ So *Wicliffe*: *Tyndale* and the remaining versions prefix the definite arti-

CRITICAL. kingdom of heaven: but whosoever GRAMMATICAL.
shall do and teach *them*, the same shall
be called great in the kingdom of
heaven. 20 For I say unto you, That
except your righteousness shall ex-
ceed *the righteousness* of the scribes
and Pharisees, ye shall in no case en-
ter into the kingdom of heaven.

21 Ye have heard that it was said
to* them of old time, Thou shalt not by
kill: and whosoever shall kill shall be
in danger of the judgment. 22 But I
say unto you, That whosoever is angry
*Many ancient authorities omit* without a cause† with his brother without a cause† shall
be in danger of the judgment: and
whosoever shall say to his brother,
Raca, shall be in danger of the coun-
cil: and‡ whosoever shall say, Thou but
fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.
23 If therefore§ thou bring thy gift to Therefore if

cle. Consistency seems to require the omission—"shall be called great . . . . shall be called least."

* The translation here adopted is not perfectly certain, the ablavital use ("by them") being grammatically defensible (see Winer, *Gramm.*, § 31, 10, p. 275, ed. Moulton; Meyer, *Kommentar*, *in loc.*), but not exegetically probable, the clause "but I say *unto* you," ver. 22, seeming to stand in such clear parallelism to the preceding words. The Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, and all the English versions adopt the dative: so also the margin. There seems, then, full reason for the change.

† The words "without a cause" are *very* doubtful. The Vatican and Sinaitic MSS., supported by several versions, omit; the remaining uncial MSS., with the Old Latin, Syriac, and Coptic versions, retain the words. In a case of such clear doubt, it would seem right to leave the words in the text, but to notice in the margin the doubtfulness of the reading.

‡ This change is necessary for consistency. There can be no reason for translating the δὲ by "and" in one clause, and "but" in the next, when the first four words in both clauses are the same. The *Genevan* and *Rhemish* alone adopt "and." The rest agree with the Authorized Version.

§ This change might seem at first sight needlessly minute. It is, however, *very* desirable to avoid, as far as possible, giving οὖν the strong illative force which the position of "wherefore" at the beginning of the sentence certainly

CRITICAL. the altar, and there **remember*** that GRAMMATICAL. rememberest
thy brother hath ought against thee;
24 Leave there thy gift before the
altar, and go thy way; first be recon-
ciled to thy brother, and then come
and offer thy gift. 25 Agree with
thine adversary quickly, **while**† thou whiles
in the way with him art with him in the way;‡ lest at
any time§ the adversary deliver thee
to the judge, and the judge deliver

seems to imply. This, as we shall find in St. Paul's Epistles, is better reserved for ἄρα. We are also preserving the same position for the illative particle which it occupies in ver. 19. The exegesis of the passage seems also to require the subordination of the inference. It was the remembrance of the grave punishment that overhangs the unloving and evil-speaking that suggests the solemn counsel in ver. 23. It does not so much directly follow from it as indirectly, and by natural consequence. The older versions preserve the order in *Auth.*, except the *Geneva*, which adopts the thoroughly correct "if then" (though not always to be pressed), and *Rhemish*, which here adopts "if therefore."

* The change to the subjunctive is apparently necessary on the principle of a parity of moods in the two clauses. Here again the *Rhemish* is with the change. The remaining versions maintain the indicative; but in the first clause *Tyndale* and *Cranmer* both preserve the indicative, and so far are consistent. The somewhat doubtful question as to when the indicative rather than the subjunctive should follow "if," is answered succinctly and with very good sense by Latham, *English Language*, § 536, vol. ii., p. 425 (ed. 4).

† "Whiles," as an archaic form (see Johnson, *Dictionary*, ed. Latham, s. v.), may be properly changed into the more usual form. All the versions have "whiles" except *Coverdale*, which agrees with the form in the text.

‡ This slight transposition is necessitated by the changed order which critical considerations seem clearly to require in the original. The emphasis thus falls more on the ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, and should be preserved in the translation. The place of emphasis in English is frequently at the close of the sentence. See Bain, *Rhetoric*, p. 100. Some valuable remarks on the importance of the order in an English sentence will be found in Marsh, *English Language*, lect. xvi., p. 347 seq.

§ The translation of μήποτε is by no means uniform in the A.V., the temporal adjunct being sometimes preserved in translation (Matt. iv., 6), sometimes omitted (Matt. vii., 6). As a rough rule, perhaps it may be said that where the idea of time is expressed (as here, ἕως ὅτου) or distinctly implied in the sentence, there the longer form should be used; where it is only latent, then the shorter form "lest" will be sufficient. The longer form here first appears in *Cranmer*.

CRITICAL. thee to the officer, and thou be cast GRAMMATICAL.
into prison. 26 Verily I say unto
thee, Thou shalt by no means come
out thence, till thou hast paid the ut-
termost farthing.

27 Ye have heard that it was said*
^by them of old time ^: Thou shalt not commit adultery.
28 But I say unto you, That whoso-
ever looketh on a woman to lust after
her hath committed adultery with her
already in his heart. 29 Yea† if thy and
right eye offend thee, pluck it out, and
cast *it* from thee: for *it* is profitable
for thee that one of thy members
should perish, and not that thy whole
body should be cast into hell. 30 And
if thy right hand offend thee, cut it
off, and cast *it* from thee: for it is
profitable for thee that one of thy
members should perish, and not that
should be cast thy whole body should go‡ into
hell. 31 It hath also§ been said, Who- It hath been
soever shall put away his wife, let him

* The reading of the text is supported by very distinctly preponderating evidence. The Curetonian Syriac and Vulgate are among the minority, but their evidence can not turn the scale.

† This is not a certain correction, as perhaps it is nearly as much too strong as the A.V. is too weak. It, however, does seem to bring out the meaning, that not only must the particular sin be avoided, but even the first motions of it in the heart checked. This is clearly felt by *Tyndale* and the *Genevan*, in both of which the translation is "therefore."

‡ The critical evidence for the text distinctly preponderates. The Rec. Text is apparently an emendatory repetition from ver. 29.

§ Not a certain correction, but still apparently necessary to mark that this is a fresh example of the contrast between the old and new dispensation. The particle δέ has here the force which its etymology suggests ("in the second place"), and which often marks its use both in the Greek Testament and elsewhere. Compare Donaldson, *New Cratylus*, § 155, p. 284. The change from "hath been" to "was" (Alford) does not, in this particular case, seem necessary.

CRITICAL. give her a writing of divorcement. GRAMMATICAL.
32 But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her **when*** divorced, that is committeth adultery.

33 Again, ye have heard that it hath been said **to** them of old time, by Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths. 34 But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven, for it is God's throne: 35 Nor by the earth, for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King. 36 Neither shalt thou swear by thy head; for thou canst not make because one hair white or black. 37 But let your **speech**† be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: communication **whatsoever** is more than these cometh for whatsoever of evil.‡

* An important correction. The participle has not the article, and must not be translated definitely. Whether, however, it should be translated "a divorced woman" generally, or as in the text, is by no means certain. The most natural view would *seem* to be that ἀπολελυμένην is what grammarians call a tertiary predicate, and that thus the reference is to one unlawfully divorced, as above specified. See De Wette and Meyer, *in loc.* It must, however, always remain an important fact in the great controversy connected with this verse, that St. Matthew has *not* inserted the article. Had he done so, it would have been certain that the reference was to the special case above-mentioned; as it is, the utmost that can fairly be said in regard of the exact inference to be drawn from the words is—*non liquet.*

† Not an important change, but apparently desirable to mark that it was *oral* communication here referred to, and conveying by speech the convictions or facts asserted either affirmatively or negatively. Comp. Meyer, *in loc.* The comment of Bengel in reference to the repeated "yea" and "nay" is very good; "*est* rei, sit *est* dicti: *non* rei, sit *non* dicti." *Wicliffe* gives as the translation, "word;" *Rhemish*, "talke." The rest as *Auth.*

‡ On the translation of this word, see the notes on chap. vi., 13.

CRITICAL. GRAMMATICAL.

38 Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. 39 But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. 40 And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have *thy* cloke also. 41 And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. 42 Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would* borrow of thee turn not thou away.

43 Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. 44 But I say unto you, Love your enemies,† ∧ and pray for them which ∧ persecute you: 45 That ye may be the sons‡ of your children Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and good,§ and sendeth rain on the just on the good

∧ bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you,

∧ despitefully use you and

* Attention may be called to this translation of *τὸν θέλοντα*. It can hardly be doubted that this form "would," which, strictly considered, implies contingent determination (see Bain, *English Grammar*, p. 104), approaches more nearly and idiomatically to the meaning of the original than any other expression. The translation "that desireth" (Alford) is heavy, and better suited to the stronger form *βούλομαι*: "that wisheth" is weak; and "that is willing" too purely independent of all latent purpose to suit, at any rate, the present passage.

† This is one of the many cases in which the two or three oldest MSS., with the best cursives and some few versions of high character, are opposed to the Codex Bezæ, supported by all the second-class uncial MSS. and many versions. Nearly all modern critics, in both cases in this verse, agree with the older witnesses, and adopt the shorter reading.

‡ See note on ver. 9.

§ Here a very rigidly accurate translation would perhaps mark the absence of the article "on evil men and good" (comp. *Wicliffe* "on good and evil men"), and similarly in the next clause. This, however, would seem to be

CRITICAL. and **unjust.** 46 For if ye love them GRAMMATICAL. on the unjust
which love you, what reward have ye?
do not even the publicans the same?*
47 And if ye salute your brethren
only, what do ye more *than others?*
publicans so? do not even the heathen the same?
48 Be ye therefore perfect, even as
your Father which is in heaven is
perfect.

## CHAPTER VI.

1 Take heed that ye do not your
alms righteousness† before men, to be
seen of them: otherwise ye have no
reward of your Father which is in
heaven. 2 **When therefore**‡ thou doest Therefore when
alms, do not sound a trumpet before *thine* alms
thee, as the hypocrites do in the syn-
agogues and in the streets, that they
may have glory of men. Verily I say
unto you, They have their reward.
3 But when thou doest alms, let not
thy left hand know what thy right
hand doeth; 4 That thine alms may
be in secret: and thy Father which

unnecessary, the general sense being expressed fully and fairly by the text, especially when the repetition of the preposition is dispensed with. The evil and good, and the just and unjust, are here considered as a whole class to whom the benefits are equally vouchsafed. See above, p. 114. note.

* The best critical editors here read *οὕτως*, but, as it would seem, not on distinctly sufficient evidence. In the next verse the balance is much more decided, the Vatican, Sinaitic, and Codex Bezæ being all on the same side.

† This is a textual change in which the state of the critical evidence is much about the same as in chap. v., 44. All the best modern editors adopt the reading in the text: *ἐλεημοσύνην* was a very natural gloss.

‡ Change made on the same principle as in chap. v., 23. The insertion of "thine" in italics in the A. V. is clearly unnecessary; see below, ver. 3. It is found in *Tyndale* and the *Genevan*, but not in *Cranmer* nor in the *Rhemish*.

CRITICAL. seeth in secret himself* shall reward† GRAMMATICAL.
^openly. thee ^.‡
thou prayest, thou shalt 5 And when ye pray, ye shall not be as the hypocrites *are:* for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. 6 But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee ^openly. ^. 7 But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. 8 Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him. 9 After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. 10 Thy kingdom come. Thy will be

* The reading is here *very* doubtful. On the whole, due regard being had to the principles of the above revision, to the state of the evidence, and to the possibility of a conformation to ver. 18, it seems best to retain the pronoun.

† The change here to "requite" (Alford) is unnecessary. No doubt "reward" is now commonly referred to the idea of repaying for good, and has lost its neutral sense of simple requital: with passages, however, such as 1 Sam. xxiv., 17, before us, it does not seem *necessary* to disturb the familiar words. Here again is a case in which the principle of least possible change seems to influence our decision.

‡ The omission of "openly" seems consistent with the principles of this revision. The three great MSS. (observe that the Alexandrian is deficient throughout the portion now before us) are in favor of the omission both here and in ver. 6, and are supported by valuable cursive MSS. and several important versions. The best critical editors also agree in the omission.

CRITICAL. done, as in heaven so also upon earth.* GRAMMATICAL. in earth as *it is* in heaven.
11 Give us this day our daily bread.
12 And forgive us our debts, as we
we forgive also have forgiven† our debtors.
13 And lead us not into temptation,
^For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen. but deliver us from evil.‡ ^14 For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: 15 But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.
16 Moreover when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad counte-

* It may be thought bold to change such familiar words, but the original Greek seems positively to require it, the clause *γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου* being thus preserved in more solemn parallelism with the two preceding clauses. The defining words do not thus, as in *Auth.*, form in effect a substantive part of the whole clause, but preserve their true logical position. The transition to the second part of the holy prayer and to our earthly needs is thus also better defined. This, however, is one of those changes which, if made by any committee, would provoke the most unfavorable criticism. It is well for us, then, to have samples of such corrections before us, that we may make up our minds on the subject beforehand, and not be swayed by the sudden prejudices of the time when they first appear. Some striking remarks on these three great clauses and their import, considered logically, will be found in an article by Hanne, in the *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie* for 1866, p. 507 seq.

† The reading is *very* doubtful on account of the division of authorities, some reading *ἀφίεμεν*, some *ἀφίομεν*, and the remaining (among which are the Vatican, Sinaitic, and Dublin Rescript) the perfect, *ἀφήκαμεν*. We adopt this with the chief critical editors. In the case of the concluding words of the verse, the preponderance for the omission is a little more distinctly defined, there being no division among the authorities on either side in favor of any third reading (as above), and the Old Latin, Coptic, and Vulgate joining with the three most ancient MSS. in favor of the omission. These words, however, it may again be observed, will not be surrendered without much controversy.

‡ Here it is perhaps best not to introduce a change, although the balance of exegetical evidence seems in favor of the masculine, "from the Evil One." Consider Rom. xvi., 20; Eph. vi., 16; 2 Thess. iii., 3; 1 John iii., 8; and compare above, chap. v., 37. In both these cases it is well worthy of notice and consideration that the great *Greek* interpreters are in favor of the masculine. Under any circumstances, the alternative rendering ought to be placed in the margin.

CRITICAL. nance: for they disfigure their faces, GRAMMATICAL.
that they may appear unto men to
fast. Verily I say unto you, They
have their reward. 17 But thou,
when thou fastest, anoint thine head,
and wash thy face; 18 That thou
appear not unto men to fast, but unto
thy Father which is in secret: and
thy Father which seeth in secret,
^openly. shall reward thee ^.*

19 Lay not up for yourselves treas-
ures upon the† earth, where moth and earth
rust doth corrupt, and where thieves
break through and steal: 20 But lay
up for yourselves treasures in heaven,
where neither moth nor rust doth cor-
rupt, and where thieves do not break
your through nor steal. 21 For where thy‡
your treasure is, there will thine heart be
also. 22 The light of the body is the
eye: if therefore thine eye be single,
thy whole body shall be full of light.
23 But if thine eye be evil, thy whole
body shall be full of darkness. If
therefore the light that is in thee

* The weight of authority for the omission is here more decided than in verse 4 and verse 6, and the omission may be deemed a certain correction.

† Accuracy seems to require this very trifling insertion. It is always a safe rule to observe the article in translation *when it appears after a preposition*. Prepositions, as is well known, so often obliterate the article (see Winer, *Grammar*, § 19, p. 157, edit. Moulton), that when it does appear it may safely be pressed. The true interpretation of the difficult words *διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας*, 1 Tim. ii., 15, seems to depend on a due recognition of this principle.

‡ These two corrections are not quite certain, though very probable. Here the Codex Bezæ and Dublin Rescript both have lacunæ. We are thus left with the Vatican and Sinaitic against the great bulk of the second-class uncial MSS. The strong support given by the versions to the two older MSS., and the agreement with them of the valuable cursives marked 1 and 28, seem to justify the correction. Comp. verse 17 for a like change to the singular.

CRITICAL. be darkness, how great *is* that darkness! GRAMMATICAL.

24 No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye can not serve God and mammon. 25 Therefore I say unto you, **Be not careful*** for your life, what ye shall eat, and what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than **the** meat, and the body than **the** raiment? 26 Behold the fowls of the air; **that**† they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? 27 Which of you by **being careful** can add one cubit unto his **lifetime**?‡ 28 And why **are ye careful** for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin. 29 And yet I say unto you,

Take no thought for
or
meat
raiment
for
taking thought
stature?
take ye thought

* On the reasons for this change, see the remarks of Trench *On the Auth. Version*, p. 13. In this same verse there is some doubt as to the reading. The evidence seems in favor of *Rec.* (*καὶ τί πίητε*), but in the translation of the text so taken the A.V. is slightly inaccurate. In the concluding words the introduction of the two definite articles is required on the principles of reasonable accuracy.

† The word in the original is *ὅτι*, and has obviously here not its causal, but its explanatory meaning "that." As Meyer observes, it is, in effect, equivalent to *εἰς ἐκεῖνο ὅτι*. Comp. John ii., 18; 2 Cor. i., 18, al.

‡ Clearly required by the context. The idea of supporting life specially by means of food in ver. 25 is expanded in ver. 26, and continued in its more general form in the present verse. All the English versions, however, adopt the current view. So also Bengel, whose comment on Luke xii., 26 is "hanc (scil. longitudinem ætatis) nemo cubitis metitur." Here again the alternative rendering should be put in the margin.

CRITICAL. That even Solomon in all his glory GRAMMATICAL.
was not arrayed like one of these.
30 **But,*** if God so clothe the grass Wherefore,
of the field, which to day is, and to
morrow is cast into the oven, *shall he*
not much more *clothe* you, O ye of
little faith? 31 **Be not therefore care-** Therefore take
**ful,** saying, What shall we eat? or, no thought,
What shall we drink? or, Where-
withal shall we be clothed? 32 For
after all these things do the Gentiles
seek: for your heavenly Father know-
eth that ye have need of all these
things. 33 But seek ye first the
kingdom of God, and his righteous-
ness; and all these things shall be
added unto you. 34 **Be not therefore** Take therefore
**careful†** for the morrow: for the mor- no thought
^the things of row shall **be careful** for ^ itself. Suf- shall take
ficient unto the day *is* the evil thought
thereof.

## CHAPTER VII.

1 Judge not, that ye be not judged.
2 For with what judgment ye judge,
ye shall be judged: and with what
measure ye mete, it shall be measured
^again. to you‡ ^. 3 And why beholdest

* The strong ratiocinative "wherefore" of *Auth.*, though found in *Tynd.*, *Cranmer*, *Gen.*, al., can not properly be maintained as the translation of the simple δέ. *Wicl.* and *Rhem.* adopt "and," but the copula is here too weak.

† The translation in the text is somewhat heavy, but is adopted to preserve a consistent rendering of *μεριμνᾶν* throughout the paragraph. *Tyndale* and the older versions translate, alike easily and forcibly, "Care not then for the morrow, but (for, *Cov.*, *Gen.*) let the morrow care for itself." Perhaps this may be thought one of the cases where idiomatic force may set aside verbal consistency.

‡ There is here no doubt whatever that *μετρηθήσεται*, not *ἀντιμετρηθήσεται*,

CRITICAL. thou the mote that is in thy brother's GRAMMATICAL.
eye, but considerest not the beam
that is in thine own eye? 4 Or how
wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me
pull out the mote out of thine eye;
and, behold, **the** beam *is* in thine own a
eye? 5 Thou hypocrite, first **pull*** cast
out the beam out of thine own eye;
and then shalt thou see clearly to **pull** cast
out the mote out of thy brother's eye.
6 Give not that which is holy unto
the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls
before swine, lest they trample them
under their feet, and turn again and
rend you.†

7 Ask, and it shall be given you;
seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it
shall be opened unto you. 8 For ev-
ery one that asketh receiveth; and
he that seeketh findeth; and to him
that knocketh it shall be opened.
9 Or what man is there of you, **of**
∧if ask whom ∧ his son shall ask bread,‡
will he give him a stone? 10 Or if
he ask he also ask a fish, will he give him a

is the true reading. The latter has only the support of cursive manuscripts and a few Greek and Latin fathers.

* It clearly can not be desirable to vary the translation of ἐκβαλεῖν in two consecutive verses.

† We have removed the mark of paragraph in the usual editions, and connect verse 6 with verse 5, but it may be admitted that the exact connection of thought does not seem perfectly clear. Perhaps the verse has a limiting character: Do what may be done to improve others with all humility, but do not carry it to such an excess that it would only too clearly be a very provocative to profanation and rejection. See Meyer, *Kommentar, in loc.*

‡ The reading is doubtful. The critical balance seems in favor of the omission of ἐάν, and the change of αἰτήσῃ into αἰτήσει. The translation is adjusted accordingly, the particle "of" being introduced to make the regimen a little more perspicuous.

CRITICAL. serpent? 11 If ye then, being evil, GRAMMATICAL.
know how to give good gifts unto
your children, how much more shall
your Father which is in heaven give
good things to them that ask him?
12 Therefore all things whatsoever ye
would that men should do to you, do
ye even so to them: for this is the
law and the prophets.

13 Enter ye in **through the narrow*** at the strait
gate: for wide *is* the gate, and broad
*is* the way, that leadeth to destruc-
tion, and many there be which go in
thereat: 14 Because† **narrow** *is* the strait
gate, and **straitened** *is* the way, which narrow
leadeth unto life, and few there be
that find it. 15 **But**‡ beware of false Beware
prophets, which come to you in sheep's
clothing, but inwardly **are** ravening they are
wolves. 16 Ye shall know them by
their fruits. Do men gather grapes
**from**§ thorns, or figs **from** thistles? of of

* The corrections in this and the following verse are for the sake of making the meaning more distinct; but it may be doubted whether the old rendering, which is that of Tyndale and the early versions, would not be maintained in any revision. At the same time, we are enabled by the change to give *τεθλιμμένη*, verse 14, a much more accurate rendering.

† The reading is here very doubtful. The second hand of the Vatican MS. and the Codex Ephremi read *τί* (how!); the first hand of the Vatican and the Sinaitic, *ὅτι*, the Alexandrian MS. (as has been already observed) and Codex Bezæ being defective. This would seem clearly a case where the principle of least possible change might be allowed to decide the question.

‡ The omission in translation of the particle *δέ* tends to obscure the connection. It would seem that verse 15 is to be connected in thought with verse 14, and that the current of the divine thought is, "If so, then beware of those who might add to your difficulties in finding the true path." Bengel's comment is "dum ipsi datis operam ut intretis, cavete eos qui claudunt." At the close the pronoun "they" is perhaps omitted with advantage. The outward garb and inward nature are thus kept more closely in antithesis.

§ A slight change, but probably necessary. In some passages, the use of

CRITICAL. 17 Even so every good tree bringeth GRAMMATICAL.
forth good fruit; but the corrupt tree a
bringeth forth evil fruit. 18 A good
tree can not bring forth evil fruit,
neither *can* a corrupt tree bring
forth good fruit. 19 Every tree that
bringeth not forth good fruit is
hewn down, and cast into the fire.
20 Wherefore by their fruits ye shall
know them.

21 Not every one that saith unto
me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the
kingdom of heaven; but he that do-
eth the will of my Father which is
in heaven. 22 Many will say to me
in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not have we not prophesied
prophesy* in thy name? and in thy
name cast out devils? and in thy have cast
name do many wonderful works? done
23 And then will I profess unto them, I
never knew you: depart from me, ye
that work iniquity.

24 Therefore whosoever heareth
these sayings of mine, and doeth
them, I will liken him unto a wise

the particle "of" as synonymous with "from" causes considerable difficulty to the general reader. See especially Luke xvi., 9.

* The futurity implied in this verse (ἡμέραν ἐκείνην εἶπε τὴν τῆς κρίσεως, Euthym.) seems to suggest an alteration, that marks, somewhat more distinctly than the ordinary compound perfect, that what is here referred to is past, and belongs to the past. It may be here conveniently observed that "did," when thus used, is purely aoristic and equivalent when united with any verb to the English preterite. This use of "do" and "did" for the present and preterite respectively, will commonly be observed in three forms of sentences as particularly serviceable, viz., emphatic, interrogative, and negative. In the last case especially this compound form will be found very serviceable. See especially the clear remarks and distinctions in Pickbourn, *Dissertation on the English Verb*, p. 25 seq.; 37 seq. (London, 1789), and compare Latham, *English Language*, § 510, vol. ii., p. 394 seq.

CRITICAL. man, which built his house upon the* GRAMMATICAL. a
rock: 25 And the rain descended,
and the floods came, and the winds
blew, and beat upon that house; and
it fell not: for it had been† founded was
upon the rock. 26 And every one a
that heareth these sayings of mine,
and doeth them not, shall be likened
unto a foolish man, which built his
house upon the sand: 27 And the
rain descended, and the floods came,
and the winds blew, and beat upon
that house; and it fell: and great
was the fall of it. 28 And it came
to pass, when Jesus had ended these
sayings, the multitudes‡ were aston- people
ished at his doctrine: 29 For he
taught them as *one* having authority,
the and not as their§ scribes.

* Not a certain correction, it being somewhat doubtful whether the article with this particular substantive can be used as idiomatically in reference to class and category as with the more familiar substantive "sand," ver. 26. It is really a matter of individual judgment. That the English article can be used generally we well know; the question, however, is whether it can be here idiomatically so used with this particular substantive. It may also be observed, as a general and safe rule for a translator, that in English the definite article (which, in fact, is really the unemphatic form of the demonstrative "that:" Bain, *English Grammar*, p. 34) is particularly definite, and does commonly and most naturally refer to something well known and defined previously. Comp. Latham, *English Language*, § 368, vol. ii., p. 208.

† The change to the pluperfect seems required, as emphasizing the antecedent fact. It will always be observed, however, that this tense is one of the least flexible of our tenses, and often gives a rigidity to a clause, which, in a general narrative especially, mars the idiomatic ease of expression. It is not clear that this is not the case here.

‡ Clearly desirable to mark what we know is so constantly expressed in the Gospels, viz., that our blessed Lord's teaching attracted, and produced great effect upon, the masses of the people. Comp. Luke xii., 1; Mark xi.,18, al.

§ The evidence in favor of the reading in the text seems distinctly preponderant. Not only the Vatican and Sinaitic Manuscripts, but the best cursives

Such would seem to be the amount of revision actually necessary, on the principles already laid down, in the important portion of Scripture on which we have been dwelling. Such, too, would probably be the average amount of correction that would be required in the Gospels generally, in a revision of the nature contemplated. The differences of reading are more and more important than at first might have been expected, but the exegetical changes few and unimportant. In the 111 verses we have 19 changes due to textual considerations, an amount not in excess of the estimated standard; but in these same verses the changes due to grammar and exegesis are only (if we count each *single* correction) about 56, or just one half of the estimated maximum amount for the New Testament generally.

We now pass to a very different portion of Scripture, in which the balance is the other way, and in which the amount of the grammatical corrections is considerable, and their general character of by no means slight importance.

We subjoin, as before, a few notes; but as the changes are numerous and in many cases self-explanatory, it does not seem desirable to comment on every individual alteration. The tenor of all is the same—not only to be faithful to the original, but also to set forth the reasoning more clearly to the general hearer and reader.

## EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS, CHAP. V.

CRITICAL. we have

1 **Being justified therefore*** by faith, GRAMMATICAL. Therefore being justified
let us have† peace with God through

and the great majority of ancient versions (always very important witnesses) all concur in the insertion of the pronoun.

* The transposition (1) gives the requisite prominence to δικαιωθέντες, and marks the close connection with the concluding words of the preceding chapter. It also (2) places the "therefore" in that subordinated position in which it seems more nearly to express that idea of retrospective reference which is usually implied by the οὖν. See Klotz, *Devarius*, vol. ii., p. 717. It may be doubted whether, in the stricter logic of these epistles, accuracy does not require that the "therefore" should not give way in many places to the more approximately correct "then." See, however, the comments on p. 112.

† The weight of evidence is so decidedly in favor of the reading of the text

CRITICAL. our Lord Jesus Christ: 2 Through GRAMMATICAL. By whom also we have had our* access have access by faith† into this grace wherein we stand; and we glory in the hope of rejoice hope the glory of God. 3 And not only *so*, but we glory in our‡ tribulations tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience; 4 And patience, approval;§ and approval, hope: 5 And experience (*bis*) hope maketh not ashamed; because

that we seem bound to adopt the hortatory ἔχωμεν rather than the simply declaratory ἔχομεν. The liability to change of vowels even in the best manuscripts, technically called itacism, must, however, always leave us—especially in such passages as the present, where the internal arguments for the less supported reading are very strong—rather in doubt as to the positive correctness of our decision. The whole subject of the orthography of the New Testament requires very careful reconsideration. See Winer, *Grammar*, § 5, p. 54 seq., edit. Moulton; and compare Scrivener, *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 417.

* The perfect must be marked. It is not merely "habemus," but "habuimus," viz., when we became Christians, and now while we are such. As Bengel rightly observes, "præteritum, in antitheto ad *habemus*, ver. 1." *Cranmer* marks this but very paraphrastically. The two other changes in the verse are slight, but necessary. It seems better to retain the same translation both for διά and for the verb καυχᾶσθαι in consecutive verses. There is no doubt an inconvenience in the use of the same word "glory" in two different senses in the same clause; but "boast" is an unpleasant translation, and "rejoice" is not exact. The insertion of the article before "hope" (in the Greek it is latent, and elided by the preposition) seems also to clear up the meaning. Comp. Heb. iii., 6.

† The reading is doubtful; the words "by faith" being omitted by the Vatican MS. and authorities of considerable weight. The addition of the Sinaitic to the retaining authorities, and the preponderance of the versions, seem to justify our maintenance of the Received Text.

‡ The article seems very clearly to have here its pronominal force—"*der* (uns betreffenden) *Leiden*," Meyer. So also in verse 11, and not uncommonly in this epistle and elsewhere. Few points require more judgment than the adoption of this pronominal translation in English. The context alone must be our guide.

§ This translation of δοκιμή is suggested by the context. The word may refer to what is antecedent ("proving," *Wicl.*; "probation," *Rhemish*, following the Vulgate), or, as here, to the resultant state, and to what is consequent. Bengel, with his usual acuteness, observes, "δοκιμή est qualitas ejus qui est δόκιμος."

| CRITICAL. | | GRAMMATICAL. |
|---|---|---|
| | the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which **was** given unto us. 6 For when we were yet without strength, in due **season*** Christ died for the ungodly. 7 For scarcely for a righteous man will **any** one die: yet peradventure for a good man some **one doth** even dare to die. 8 But God commendeth his **own** love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. 9 Much more then, being now justified by his blood, **shall we** be saved through him **from the wrath**† *to come.* 10 For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God **through** the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, **shall we** be saved by his life. 11 And not only *so*, but we also **glory** in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, **through** whom we have now received the **reconciliation.** | is<br>time<br>will one<br>some would<br>his love<br>we shall be saved from wrath<br>by<br>we shall<br>joy<br>by<br>atonement |
| | 12 **For this cause,**‡ as by one man sin entered into the world, and **by sin,** | Wherefore<br>and death by sin |

* The *exact* meaning of these words is greatly contested, there being at least four different shades of meaning that have been assigned to the simple words *κατὰ καιρὸν*. Such being the case, the more exact translation of the word *καιρός* seems required on the principle of faithfulness. The idea that the death of our blessed Lord was verily at the critical time, is thus, perhaps, a little more clearly brought out.

† The article prefixed to *ὀργῆς* must certainly be noticed in translation. This can only be done as in the text, or by translating "*God's* wrath," the insertion being suggested and justified by the antithetical idea in verse 7. The change adopted in the text seems to be the simplest.

‡ This change seems desirable. In a connection so closely logical as that of St. Paul, it is clearly of great importance to maintain, as far as consistent with our idiom, a correct translation of the particles of inference and reasoning. The stronger word "wherefore" (equivalent to "and therefore," according to Bain, *English Grammar*, p. 67) is best reserved for *ἄρα* or *ἄρα οὖν*.

| CRITICAL. | | GRAMMATICAL. |
|---|---|---|
| | death; and so death passed **through*** | upon |
| | **unto** all men, for that all **sinned.**† 13 | have sinned |
| | For until the law sin was in the | |
| | world: but sin is not imputed when | |
| | there is no law. 14 Nevertheless | |
| | death reigned from Adam to Moses, | |
| | even over them that had not sinned | |
| | after the similitude of **the** trangres- | Adam's transgr. |
| | sion **of Adam,** who is the **type** of him | figure |
| | that was to come. 15 **Howbeit** not | But |
| | as the **trespass,**‡ so also *is* the free | offence (*bis*) |
| | gift. For if **by** the **trespass** of **the** | through one, many be dead, |
| | one, **the** many **died;** much more **did** | more the |
| | the grace of God, and the gift by | |
| | grace, *which is* by **the** one man, Jesus | one |
| | Christ, abound unto **the** many. 16 | hath abounded many |
| | And not as *it was* **through** one that | by |
| | sinned, *so is* the gift: for the judg- | |
| | ment *came* **of**§ one **unto** condemna- | *was* by one to |
| | tion, but the free gift *came* of many | *is* |

* It is hardly possible to avoid noticing in translation the carefully chosen *διῆλθεν*, especially when following the *εἰσῆλθεν* just above. The *pervasive* power of death seems here specially marked.

† The translation of the simple word *ἥμαρτον* is here extremely difficult. The true idea "omnes peccarunt *peccante Adamo*" (Bengel) seems to be best brought out by the omission of the auxiliary. At the same time, it may be admitted that the idea of individual sins (see especially Theodoret, *in loc.*), which it seems also theologically correct to include, is not so distinctly maintained as in the "have sinned" of the older versions. This, then, can not be considered by any means a certain correction, though it seems preferable to the A. V., and to the "were sinners" of the *Five Clergymen*.

‡ It seems necessary to maintain a careful translation of *παράπτωμα*. The translation of A.V. ("offence") does not preserve the latent antithesis to the *ὑπακοή* that was shown by Christ. Compare ver. 19.

§ The slight change is to mark the change of preposition. Such alterations would not be introduced generally, but in passages such as the present, where every word in the inspired original is of doctrinal importance, great accuracy would appear to be required. This remark may be extended to many of the changes in this very profound and difficult chapter. No part of the New Testament is more trying to a reviser.

| CRITICAL. | | GRAMMATICAL. |
|---|---|---|
| | trespasses unto justification. 17 For | offences |
| | if by the trespass of the one, death | one man's offence |
| | reigned through the one; much more | by one |
| | shall they which receive the abun- | they abundance |
| | dance of the grace and of the gift of | grace |
| | righteousness, reign in life through | shall reign |
| | the one, even Jesus Christ. 18 Where- | by one |
| | fore, as through one trespass *it came** | Therefore as by the offence of |
| | unto all men to condemnation; even | one *judgment came* upon .... |
| | so through one righteous act† *it came* | by the righteousness of one, *the free gift came* |
| | unto all men to justification of life. | upon all men |
| | 19 For as by‡ the disobedience of the | unto |
| | one man, the many were made sinners, | one man's disobedience many |
| | even so, by the obedience of the one, | so one |
| | shall the many be made righteous. | many |
| | 20 Moreover the law also entered, | law entered |
| | that the trespass might be multiplied. | offence abound |
| | But where sin was multiplied, grace | abounded, |

* Here the principle of faithfulness seems to require that as little as possible should be imported into the context. Winer suggests the simple introduction of the purely neutral ἀπέβη, *i. e.*, "cessit," "the result was" ("the issue was," *Five Clergymen*), and correctly. See *Grammar*, § 64, 2, b, p. 734, ed. Moulton. The common supplement is τὸ κρῖμα ἐγένετο for the first clause, and τὸ χάρισμα ἐγένετο for the second, but this is interpretation rather than translation.

† On the translation of δικαίωμα, δικαιόω, δίκαιος, and δικαιοσύνη, see the prefatory notes to the translation of this epistle by the *Five Clergymen*, p. ix. seq.

‡ Here it does not seem necessary to change the "by" into "through," as in verse 18 and elsewhere. It is almost impossible to lay down any rules, but it perhaps may be said that though in certain formulæ (*e. g.*, "through Jesus Christ"), and in passages where there are clear or even latent distinctions between direct and mediate agency, there it may be desirable to use "by" in reference to the primary agent (Bain, *English Grammar*, p. 55), and "through" in reference to the "causa medians;" but where there are no such distinctions, there the A. V. may be retained, unless, as in chap. v., 1, 2, consistency suggests the change. To carry out the principle farther than this (as in Alford, *New Testament*, and frequently in the revision of the *Five Clergymen*) is to obliterate so far an idiomatic usage of the preposition which was current in our earlier literature, and is, in this particular instance, radically to change our version.

CRITICAL. did much more abound: 21 That as GRAMMATICAL.
sin reigned in death, even so might hath reigned unto
grace reign through righteousness
unto eternal life, through Jesus Christ by
our Lord.

## CHAPTER VI.

1 What shall we say then? are
shall we we to* continue in sin, that grace
may abound? 2 God forbid. How
shall we, who died† unto sin, live any that are dead to
longer therein? 3 Or‡ know ye not, Know
that so many of us as were baptized
into Christ Jesus, were baptized into Jesus Christ
his death? 4 We were buried there- Therefore we are
fore with him by our baptism into baptism
death: that like as Christ was raised raised up
from the dead by the glory of the
Father, even so we also should walk
in newness of life. 5 For if we have
become united to§ the likeness of his been planted together in
death, surely‖ we shall be also *to the* we shall *in*

* Change to express the deliberative subjunctive (Winer, *Grammar*, § 41, 4), the reading of the Textus Receptus, *ἐπιμενοῦμεν*, having only the support of cursive MSS., and being probably a conformation in tense to the *ἐροῦμεν* just before.

† The change, though trifling, seems necessary, as helping to direct the thought to the past epoch of baptism, when the death took place (verse 3). The *Auth.* points more to the continuing state, which is true ("in baptismo *et* justificatione," Bengel), but not here the prominent idea.

‡ In some cases, and in this particular formula, the force of the particle seems obliterated. Here, however, the force may be brought out: "Or, if ye do not recognize this principle (verse 2), do ye not know, etc." (verse 3). See Hartung, *Partikellehre*, vol. ii., p. 61.

§ The translation of the A.V. seems actually erroneous, *σύμφυτος* being connected with *φύω*, not with *φυτεύω*. In the latter case it would have been *συμφυτευτοί*, the verbal *φυτευτὸς* being a recognized form. See Plato, *Republ.*, vi., p. 510.

‖ The emphatic introduction of the contrary aspect by means of the *ἀλλὰ*

CRITICAL. *likeness* of *his* resurrection. 6 Knowing this, that our old man **was** crucified with *him*, that the body of sin might be destroyed, **in order*** that we should serve sin **no longer.** 7 For he that is dead is **made free** from sin. 8 Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him: 9 Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. 10 For in that† he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. 11 **Even so**‡ reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God, **in Christ Jesus** ^our Lord. . 12 Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey ^it in the lusts thereof. 13 Neither yield ye your members *as* instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves **up to**§

GRAMMATICAL. is — that — henceforth we should not — freed. — Likewise — through J.C. — unto God

*και* ought to be marked in translation. The formula is noticed and illustrated in Klotz, *Devarius*, vol. ii., p. 93.

* The insertion of the two words "in order" renders the passage a little clearer, and just calls attention to the change of construction from the particle of purpose with the subj. to the favorite N.T. genitival infin. of purpose. See Winer, *Grammar*, § 44, 4. In the remaining words of the verse the more usual translation of the emphatically placed *μηκέτι* is adopted, and the emphasis secured by placing it at the close of the sentence.

† This is one of the instances in which the A.V. would probably not be changed by any revisers who followed the principle of the least possible change. It may be observed, however, that ὃ is more probably the cognate accusative under the regimen of *ἀπέθανε*, scil. "the death that he died," and similarly "the life that he liveth." This is a case, then, where this alternative rendering ought certainly to find a place in the margin. See above, ch. iv., p. 116.

‡ The application of the principle in verse 10 to the readers is rather obscured by the "likewise." So, however, *Tyndale* and the older versions, except *Wicliffe* and the *Rhemish*, which follow the "ita" of the Vulgate.

§ An attempt to mark the change to the more emphasized aorist imperative

CRITICAL. God, as alive from the dead, and your members *as* instruments of righteousness unto God. 14 For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace.

GRAMMATICAL. those that are alive

shall we 15 What then? are we to sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid. 16 Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether it be of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness? 17 But God be thanked, that ye *once** were the servants of sin, but ye obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you.† 18 Now being made free from sin, ye were made the servants of righteousness. 19 I speak after the manner of men, because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto sanctification. 20 For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free in regard to‡ righteousness. 21 What fruit

whether of

ye were

have obeyed

Being then

became

have yielded

holiness.

from

παραστήσατε, "do it at once, and decidedly." This change did not escape the vigilant eye of Bengel; "majorem vim habet mox aor. 1 παραστήσατε."

* This italicized word seems required to mark the emphasis that clearly rests on the ἦτε: the bondage is over; the chain snapped.

† Here again we have an alternative rendering, "the form of doctrine whereunto ye were delivered," the relative clause admitting two or even three forms of resolution. This latter is, for grammatical reasons, the most probable (see Meyer, *in loc.*), and has in its favor the authority of Chrysostom. Here again the margin would have to be used.

‡ If an attempt is to be made to express the idiomatic use of the dative τῇ

CRITICAL. **then** had ye **at that time** in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things *is* death. 22 But now being made free from sin, and **made** servants to God, ye have your fruit unto **sanctification,** and the end everlasting life. 23 For the wages of sin *is* death; but the gift of God *is* eternal life in **Christ Jesus** our Lord.

GRAMMATICAL. fruit had ye then

become holiness,

through Jesus Christ

## CHAPTER VII.

1 Know ye not, brethren (for I speak to **men** that know the law), how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? 2 For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to **her living** husband;* but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of **her** husband. 3 **Wherefore** if, while **her** husband liveth, she be **joined**† to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is

them

*her* husband so long as he liveth

*her*

So then *her* married

*δικαιοσύνη* (see Winer, *Grammar*, § 31, 6) it can only be by this adverbial phrase. It seems proper to use the form "in regard *to*" rather than the more familiar "in *regard of*," as the writers of the seventeenth century appear to have drawn a distinction in meaning between the two phrases, the former implying "in reference to," the latter "by reason of." See the acute remarks on these and similar forms of Marsh, *On the English Language*, lect. xxix., p. 660 seq.

* The translation of the A.V. is here actually erroneous, the position of the participle being between the article and the noun, and not, as the A.V. would suggest, after the noun, and so a tertiary predicate. See, on the three kinds of predicates, Donaldson, *New Cratylus*, § 301 seq.

† This is not a correction of any moment, but seems desirable on account of the verses that follow, where the expression recurs. *Tyndale* and the older versions translate "couple herself."

CRITICAL. no adulteress, though she be **joined** to GRAMMATICAL. married another man. 4 **So then,*** my bretheren, ye also **were made** dead to the Wherefore are become law by the body of Christ; that ye should be **joined** to another, *even* to married him who **was** raised from the dead, is that we should bring forth fruit unto God. 5 For when we were in the flesh, the **stirrings** of sins, which were motions by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. 6 But now we **have been loosed**† from the are delivered that being dead law, having died‡ unto that wherein we were held; **so that we** that we should serve in the newness of the spirit, newness spirit and not *in* the oldness of the letter.

7 What shall we say then? *Is* the law sin? God forbid. **Howbeit,**§ I Nay, had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. 8 But sin, taking occasion‖ by the

* The particle ὥστε has more of a consecutive rather than of a strongly ratiocinative force. As "wherefore" appears to be a very convenient translation for ἄρ' οὖν, we may perhaps properly interchange in English the first words of verse 3 and verse 4. *Tyndale* and the older versions had "so then" in the former verse, and "even so" in the latter.

† Here we have a word of great variety of meaning in the N. T., and one never easy to translate. The change suggested is not of importance, but seems to help the sense.

‡ The reading is slightly interesting as showing that our revisers must have had before them the edition of Beza, 1565, and here preferred it (see the margin) to the 3d edition of Stephens, though it would seem that the reading ἀποθανόντος is only due to an error of Beza's: see Tischendorf, *in loc.* This the A.V. places in the margin.

§ This change seems positively necessary to bring out the reasoning of the passage. The law was certainly not sin, but it stood so far in connection with it that it made it known; ἁμαρτία μὲν οὐκ ἔστι, γνωριστικὸς δὲ ἁμαρτίας. —Theoph.

‖ Perhaps it might be a little more accurate, both here and in verse 11, to

CRITICAL. commandment, wrought in me all GRAMMATICAL.
manner of **coveting.** For without the concupiscence.
law sin **is** dead. 9 **And** I was alive *was* For
without the law once: but when the
commandment came, sin revived, and
I died. 10 And the **very** command- the commandm.
ment, which *was* **for** life, I found *to be ordained* to
**for** death. 11 For sin, taking occa- unto
sion by the commandment, deceived
me, and by it slew me. 12 **So that** Wherefore
the law **indeed** *is* holy, and the com- *is*
mandment holy, and just, and good.

13 **Is** then that which is good **be-** was
**come** death unto me? God forbid. made
But sin *became so*, that it might ap- But sin, that
pear sin, working death **to** me by that in
which is good; that **by the command-** that sin by the commandment
**ment sin** might become exceeding sin-
ful. 14 For we know that the law is
spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under
sin. 15 For **what I perform,* that I** that which I do I allow
**know** not: for what I would, that do
I not; but what I hate, that I **do.** 16 do I.
But if I do that which I would not, I If then
consent unto the law that *it is* good.

translate "having taken," as the act specified by the particle was prior to that of the verb, "took occasion and, etc.;" but where there is nothing in the context that requires the time of the actions to be specially marked, we may retain the looser translation. On the translation of participles, when thus with finite verbs, see *Commentary on Phil.* ii., 30.

* There is nearly an insurmountable difficulty in marking properly in translation the shades of meaning in the κατεργάζομαι, πράσσω, and ποιῶ. For the first and strongest of the three we may retain the translation adopted by *Auth.*, in verse 18; but between the two last it seems hopeless to attempt to discriminate in English. All that can be said is that πράσσω is the stronger of the two, and appears to involve the idea of accomplishment. Comp. Rom. i., 32, and see Buttmann, *Lexilogus*, § 95, 3, p. 493 (transl.). The various changes in this verse are all slight, but seem to bring out the meaning with more distinctness than the Authorized Version.

CRITICAL. Now then, it is no more I that perform GRAMMATICAL. do
it, but sin that dwelleth in me. 18
For I know that there dwelleth not that in me
in me, that is, in my flesh, any good dwelleth no
thing: for to will is present with me; good
^how but ^ to perform that which is good
I find not is not. 19 For the good that I
would, I do not: but the evil which
I would not, that I do. 20 Now if I
do that I would not, it is no more I
that perform it, but sin that dwelleth do
in me. 21 I find therefore this* law, then a
that, when I would do good, evil is
present with me. 22 For I delight in
the law of God after the inward man:
23 But I see a different† law in my another
members, warring against the law of
my mind, and bringing me into cap-
tivity to the law of sin which is in
my members. 24 O wretched man
that I am! who shall deliver me from
the body of this death? 25 I thank
God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.
Wherefore with the mind I myself So then
serve the law of God; but with the
flesh the law of sin.

* It is very rarely that the article can properly be so translated. Here, however, it seems required by the idiom of our language. The translation, "the law," would also lead to confusion. *Tyndale* and all the early versions (except *Wicliffe* and the *Rhemish*) appear to have been misled by this use of the words.

† Here it seems certainly necessary to give the accurate translation of ἕτερος. It was not merely ἄλλος νόμος, but ἕτερος νόμος. See Tittmann, *Synon.*, p. 155 seq. and on the difference between the words, comp. notes *on Gal.* i., 6.

## CHAPTER VIII.

CRITICAL. GRAMMATICAL.

1 *There is* therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus ^who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.*^. 2 For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and of death. 3 For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of **the flesh of sin,**† and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: 4 That the **righteous demand**‡ of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. 5 For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit. 6 For **the mind of the flesh** *is* death; but **the mind of the Spirit** *is* life and peace. 7 Because the **mind of the flesh** *is* enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. 8 **And**§

and death.

sinful flesh,

righteousness

to be carnally minded

to be spiritually minded

carnal mind

So then

* There is considerable diversity in the readings of these words in those authorities in which they or a part of them are contained. The evidence for their complete omission is, however, perfectly distinct and preponderant.

† Here there seems no sufficient reason for departing from the strict translation. For remarks on this form of genitive, see above, p. 109. All the older versions adopt the adjectival translation, except *Wicliffe* and the *Rhemish*, both having had the guidance of the Vulgate.

‡ The translation of δικαίωμα is by no means easy. The *Auth.* confounds it with δικαιοσύνη, the Vulgate ("justificatio") with δικαίωσις. The etymological form of the word, however, precludes both forms of translation, and limits us to the meaning adopted in the text. It is worthy of notice that Tyndale and Coverdale both recognized the true meaning, though they adopt a somewhat paraphrastic translation, viz., "the righteousness required of the law."

§ This correction is necessary for the logic of the passage, as well as for

CRITICAL. they that are in the flesh can not GRAMMATICAL.
please God. 9 But ye are not in the
flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that
the Spirit of God dwell* in you. **But** Now
if any man have not the Spirit of
Christ, he is none of his. 10 And if
Christ *be* in you, the body **indeed** *is* body *is*
dead because of sin; but the Spirit *is*
life because of righteousness. 11 But
if the Spirit of him that raised up
Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he
that raised up Christ from the dead
shall **quicken also** your mortal bodies also quicken
by† his Spirit that dwelleth in you.

the removal of the thoroughly erroneous assumption that δέ can ever be equivalent to οὖν. The particle has here its usual transitional force. It reverts to the abstract statement in the first clause of verse 8, and adds to it the illustration of actual experience, the second clause of that verse being parenthetical. In English we have probably no better translation than the simple "and," but it is confessedly defective, as not marking the transition (from the abstract to the concrete) that is brought out by the δέ, and very fairly expressed by the "autem" of the Vulgate. The only other translation "now," as used in our ordinary argumentative English, is too strong, and suggests too much the commencement of a fresh argument, whereas we have here only the *continuation under a slightly changed form* of foregoing statements. These may seem at first mere niceties, but, on sober consideration, it will be seen that our appreciation of the mind of the inspired writer depends on our due recognition of them. All corrections of this nature are important and necessary.

* It might at first seem doubtful whether this mood is strictly correct. Consideration would seem to show that it is, as the particle in the original (εἴπερ) involves no decision (Winer, *Grammar*, § 53, 9), and the case is one that may or may not be as stated. In such cases English idiom appears to require the subjunctive; where, however, a case is contemplated as actually in existence, then the indicative is most usual. See Latham, *Engl. Lang.*, § 537, and the comments in my notes *on* 2 *Thess.* iii., 14 (*transl.*). As Meyer acutely observes, the words carry with them an indirect exhortation to test the fact. We retain, then, the subjunctive throughout. On the true meaning of εἴπερ ("si omnino"), see Klotz, *Devarius*, vol. ii., p. 308, 528, and the very good note of Moulton in Winer, *Gramm.*, *l. c.*, p. 561 seq., on the uses of εἴπερ and εἴγε.

† This is another interesting proof that the revisers of 1611 were probably

CRITICAL. 12 **Wherefore** brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, **that we should*** live after the flesh. 13 For if ye live after the flesh, ye **must†** die: but if **by the Spirit ye** mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. 14 For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons‡ of God. 15 For ye **received not** the spirit of bondage again **unto** fear; but ye **received** the Spirit

GRAMMATICAL. Therefore to shall if ye through the Spirit do have not received to have received

using the text of the fourth edition of Beza, with some preference over that of Stephens. The difference is that the former reads διά with the genitive throughout the clause, the latter διά with the accusative, which, however, is noticed in the margin. As it is extremely difficult to decide which way the critical balance turns, we may perhaps rightly fall back upon the Sinaitic Manuscript as an arbiter, and so, with that ancient witness, retain the genitive, and the translation as existing in our own version.

* See above, notes on chap. vi., 6, note *, p. 136.

† Necessary to express the explicit words in the original, μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν. In the second clause it is the simple future ζήσεσθε. The change in the remainder of the verse is to remove the emphasis which *Auth.* seems accidentally to give to the "ye" by the prominence of its position. The pronoun is not (as is usual in cases of emphasis) expressed in the Greek, and the emphasis, it may be added, is obviously on Πνεῦμα.

‡ There is no necessity, with some revisers, to remove the article. It is not found in the Greek, but it may here be properly retained in the English: *First*, because, as has been already hinted, the use of the article in English is by no means coincident in all cases with that of the Greek. The presence or absence of the article in the case of the latter noun, when, as here, two nouns are in regimen, influences its use with the governing noun much more distinctly than is the case even in the best English. *Secondly*, there are several cases in Greek, especially, as here, after verbs implying name, existence, etc., where the article, to speak strictly, becomes latent. See Bp. Middleton, *Greek Art.*, iii., 3, 2, p. 43 (ed. Rose), and Green, *Grammar*, p. 35 seq., where there are some acute remarks on this usage. There are also several other cases—*e. g.*, art. with abstract nouns, omission (*a*) after a preposition, (*b*) when a dependent genitive supplies sufficient definition, (*c*) before certain well-known nouns (see the long list in Winer, *Grammar*, § 19, p. 149 seq., ed. Moulton), in which the idioms of the two languages are not the same, and where the reviser must be especially on his guard. We notice this at length, as, in our very best specimens of scholarly revision, many instances will be found of want of full appreciation of the differences of usage in English and Greek as to the absence or the presence of the article. The whole subject requires accurate consideration.

CRITICAL. of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, GRAMMATICAL.
Father. 16 The Spirit itself beareth
witness with our spirit that we are
the children of God: 17 And if chil-
dren, then heirs; heirs of God, and
joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that
we suffer with *him*, that we may also be also
be glorified with *him*. together.

18 For I reckon that the sufferings
of this present time *are* not worthy
*to be compared* with the glory which
is to be revealed in us. 19 For the shall be
earnest expectation of the creation is creature waiteth
tarrying* for the revelation of the manifestation
sons of God. 20 For the creation was creature
made subject to vanity, not willingly,
but by reason of him who hath sub-
jected *the same* in hope; 21 Because† creature
the creation itself also shall be deliv-
ered from the bondage of corruption
into the liberty of the glory of the glorious liberty
children of God. 22 For we know
that the whole creation groaneth and
travaileth in pain together until now.

* Here the double compound ἀπεκδέχεται seems to require, both as to tense and meaning, the change suggested in the text. It is, however, a change which perhaps is to be considered a so-called improvement rather than a correction, and so might be judged by many to be unnecessary. The change in the almost technical word that follows is perhaps of more moment, as serving to bring out still more clearly the time and circumstances of the manifestation. Compare Col. iii., 4; 1 John iii., 2, al.

† Here the preponderance of exegetical argument seems in favor of the translation "in hope *that* the creation," etc., the ὅτι being not causal, but demonstrative. See especially the good note of Meyer, *in loc.* The same remark applies also to the particle in verse 27. This, however, is just one of those doubtful passages in which the exegetical preponderance hardly seems *quite* sufficient to justify the substitution in a revision made on principles such as the present. The alternative reading should, however, certainly be placed in the margin. It is so placed by the translators in verse 27.

| CRITICAL. | | GRAMMATICAL. |
|---|---|---|
| | 23 And not only *they*, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, **tarrying** for the adop- | waiting |
| | tion, *to wit*, the redemption of our body. 24 For we are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he **also** | yet |
| | hope for **it**? 25 But if we hope for that we see not, *then* do we with patience **tarry** for it. 26 **In like manner** | wait Likewise |
| infirmities: | the Spirit also helpeth our weakness:* for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession | |
| for us | for *us* with groanings which can not be uttered. 27 **But** he that searcheth | And |
| | the hearts knoweth what *is* the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to *the will of* God. | |
| | 28 **Moreover**† we know that all | And |
| | things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to *his* purpose. 29 **Because** whom he **foreknew**, he also | For did foreknow, |

* The reading requires a change from the plural to the singular. As a change has thus to be made, we have taken advantage of it to substitute the simpler word used by Coverdale ("weakness") for the less easy though scripturally familiar term "infirmity."

† This seems a necessary change, it being designed to mark the commencement of another and third clause illustrative of the main statement. The connection would seem to be as follows. The last words of verse 17 form the kind of text. Arguments of encouragement and consolation then follow—the first, verses 18–25; the second, verses 26, 27; the third, verses 28–31. The transitions are, however, so easy that it does not seem desirable to mark each one off by a separate paragraph.

CRITICAL. **foreordained*** *to be* conformed to the GRAMMATICAL. did predestinate
image of his Son, that he might be
the firstborn among many brethren.
30 And whom he **foreordained**, them Moreover did predestinate
he also called: and whom he called,
them he also justified: and whom he
justified, them he also glorified.

31 What **then**† shall we say to then say
these things? If God *be* for us, who
*can be* against us? 32 He that
spared not his own Son, but deliv-
ered him up for us all, how shall he
not **also with him** freely give us all with him also
things? 33 Who shall lay any thing
to the charge of God's elect?‡ *It is*
God that justifieth; 34 Who *is* he
that condemneth? *It is* Christ that
died, yea **more**, that is risen again, rather,
who is **also**§ at the right hand of even
God, who also maketh intercession

* Such a change as this would perhaps hardly be adopted by any body of revisers. Still, it does seem desirable to remove a word of theological controversy when a simpler and better word is at hand. It seems also best to preserve the simply aoristic translation throughout the pronoun. In regard of the preceding pronoun it might perhaps be clearer if we adopted the longer form "those whom," as in some of the earlier versions; but this is one of those many cases where, the meaning being quite plain, the A.V. may be left untouched.

† This slight change of position seems desirable as marking the commencement of the paragraph, and the statement of logical consequence which now follows.

‡ The exact punctuation of this passage, and the relation of the clauses to each other, is much contested. Perhaps the most probable punctuation is, "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? God is he that justifieth, who is he that condemneth?" In what follows the term δικαιῶν seems to have at once introduced the mention of the name of the Justifier, which thus appears in an appended clause: "As regards Christ, he it is verily who died," etc. Then follows the noble and triumphant question in verse 35.

§ This trivial change seems required to continue evenly the climax. The "even" rather tends to import a thought not in the context.

CRITICAL. for us. 35 Who shall separate us GRAMMATICAL.
from the love of Christ? *shall* tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? 36 **Even*** as it is written, As
For thy sake **are we** killed all the we are
day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. 37 **Yet,†** in all Nay,
these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. 38 For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor princi-
principalities, nor powers, nor things
palities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, 39 Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature,‡ shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Result of the whole.

The amount and nature of the corrections in the foregoing portion is, as we have already observed, considerable on the right-hand margin, but inconsiderable on the left. The changes due to textual revision in

* The two changes in this verse apparently help the general context. They again stand on the debatable ground of being merely "improvements;" but, being small changes, and not appearing in any way to interfere with the rhythm of the verse, they *perhaps* may appear. The second just hints at the change of tenses in the original. An aoristic translation of ἐλογίσθημεν (compare verse 24) would seem to be an *overcorrection*, as tending to turn the reader's thoughts more definitely to the past, as the past, than the context requires.

† Here it seems clearly necessary to preserve unambiguously (the "nay" is rather of doubtful meaning) the contrast specified in this verse: "Though thus persecuted, yet," etc. In some of the older versions "nevertheless" is adopted. This, however, seems here a little too heavy.

‡ The translation "created thing" would make the meaning more plain; but change is perhaps not necessary. The student may be reminded that the difference between verbals terminating in -σις and -μα is, as in this word, sometimes obliterated in the N. T. Compare notes *on Phil.* iv., 6.

the 108 verses are only 11, or much below the average; but the amount of grammatical corrections is very decidedly above it, the number of such changes being about 170 in all. When we combine, however, these results with those derived from the former portion of Scripture, and observe the actual amount in the 219 verses, we have finally 30 changes owing to critical considerations, and about 226 changes which *seem** to be required, on the principles already laid down, by grammar and general interpretation; or, in other words, not quite the estimated amount of one correction for every five verses in the matter of criticism and text, and slightly more than one for every verse in respect of general revision.

We are now at length able to proceed onward, and are in a position fairly to test the justice and cogency of current objections to revision. We now know approximately the extent to which revision would probably extend, and are certainly justified in declining to answer objections which are founded on the assumption that revision would be so great as distinctly to alter the tone and character of the present version. Six changes in every five verses, and probably three at least of these of a *very* slight kind, could by no stretch of imagination produce the results which are so justly deprecated.

As will be seen in the next chapter, the resultant question will really be whether the arguments derived from considerations of the faithfulness due to God's Word do fairly preponderate over those which rest on the general undesirableness of introducing changes when they will not be more than what has been already specified.

* We italicize the word, as we are quite conscious that there may be several changes in these 219 verses in which the shadowy line between mere improvement and necessary correction has not been always observed. It is hard to resist the temptation to introduce a change when it is clear that the change brings out more distinctly the meaning of the inspired words, but this is a feeling which revisers must watch.

## CHAPTER VI.

### OBJECTIONS TO REVISION, VALID AND INVALID.

We are now at length in a position to discuss the current objections to revision, and may shortly notice what has been urged by sober thinkers against the course which has been advocated in these pages.

Nature of the current objections.

Of these objections, some are invalid and unreasonable, and are of such a nature, considered logically, that we may wonder that they stand in connection with the honored names with which they have been recently associated. There are, however, as we have indicated at the close of the last chapter, some objections of real force and validity, which have lately been urged against revision, and to them we shall give, as far as we are able, respectful answers; but to the majority of current objections really no answer need be returned. They are based on the assumption that great changes are contemplated, and that no revision could be undertaken without involving them, whereas what has been suggested in the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury is very different, and much more historically probable. The argument assumes usually the form of a dilemma. Either there must be great change, or comparatively little change: if the former, it is obviously undesirable; if the latter, it is not worth while moving in a matter where the principle of *quieta non movere* is commonly considered to have great weight. The latter portion of this dilemma is that only with which we are here concerned.

Objections not always fairly urged.

It must be observed, however, that the opponents of revision have not kept these two considerations properly apart. Even in the Northern Convocation, where the learning and weight of the speakers might

have led to the expectation that the subject would be discussed with calmness of thought and with fairness of reasoning, several of the speakers not only used arguments which belong to one portion of the dilemma when really the other portion was that only which was properly under consideration, but even adopted expressions which would seem to indicate some amount of bias and prejudgment. For instance, when one prelate urges as an objection that the power of writing clear and dialectic English had failed, what connection can such a comment have with a proposal for introducing a limited number of verbal changes? Or, again, when another prelate begins his speech by saying that touching the English Bible is like touching the ark, what can we feel but that strong prejudice is imported just where scholars and theologians would most deprecate its introduction? A tacit appeal is really made to strong predilections, which, however rightful in themselves, are commonly found inconsistent with the coolness and sobriety of judgment which no subject needs more imperatively than the present. Even the president of the venerable body used language and adopted a simile, viz., that of the rider by a precipice at night, which to his clear and logical mind must have seemed, on consideration, to have involved some amount of antecedent bias. Other expressions, too, were used, which we must venture to consider as unduly strong when taken in connection with the proposals *actually* before the deliberative assembly. Surely no one contemplates, or ever did contemplate, except in the days of Purver and Harwood, "sending down our beloved Bible into the crucible to be melted down." At any rate, the resolution of the Province of Canterbury, with its distinct specifications and guarded language, stood in no degree of connection with any such unreasonable and extravagant design.

Counter proposals urged in Northern Convocation.

Now when we pass from the arguments to the counter-proposals with which they were associated—such, for instance, as to encourage independent scholars to make their revisions, or to wait for the

lingering Speaker's Commentary, as it has been called, what do they amount to but to proposals practically to encourage that which experience has proved valueless, and which subsequently the most reverend speaker himself very properly deprecated—the so-called improved versions of individual revisers? If we were to take the indirect suggestion of another prelate, and wait patiently for the Speaker's Commentary, what really would our gain be? It would amount to no more than the opinion of another competent scholar to be added to the many that, in the New Testament at least, have already been given as to the true translation of the passages under consideration. What we now want is not any increase of individual opinions, but the collective opinion of a full company of scholars on the best translation in passages where the Authorized Version is judged to need revision. If the Speaker's Commentary were to give us corrections of this kind, we should be wise to wait patiently for it; but if we are only to wait for suggested corrections emanating from individuals, who may be very good commentators, but very unpracticed revisers, why, we wait really for very little. The Speaker's Commentary will probably be a great addition to our exegetical literature, and a most welcome aid to the theological student, but it absolutely can give little more, and professes to give little more, in each place, than *the judgment of the single commentator*. With such a work as is under present contemplation, viz., a revision of our version by a body of competent scholars, it really has scarcely any thing in common. A commentary is probably always done best by a single mind; a revision, as we have already especially endeavored to show in a former chapter, must be, if it is to be successful, the result of the judgment of *several* minds *conferring together*, and doing their work, as much as possible, round a common table.

Three important objections.

We may, then, without any disrespect to the speakers, plainly dismiss these various arguments and proposals as being really only the old *argu-*

*menta inertiæ*, reproduced with some degree of vigor, and at once proceed to those real objections which no one can afford lightly to pass by. These objections are only three in number: *first*, that revision would tend to unsettle; *secondly*, that it would probably loosen the bond between ourselves and Nonconformists, and, indeed, between the Church of England and the American and colonial churches, the present Authorized Version being common to all; *thirdly*, that it would encourage still farther revisions, and that the great changes in our version, which we all agree to deprecate, would be brought about by successive revisions—in a word, that there would be no finality.

Antecedent consideration: latent objections.

These three objections certainly require thoughtful consideration, and to them it may be well to devote the remainder of this chapter. One preliminary consideration, however, must be borne in mind, that, even were these objections greater than they really will be found to be, there still remains on the other side the great argument of duty, which with some minds will outweigh every other consideration, whether of convenience or of religious policy. Now if it be conceded that there *are* errors in our present version, and if it also be conceded that they are fairly removable, and that any competent body of scholars could hopefully address itself to the work, then surely every principle of loyalty to God's Word requires that this work should be done. It is not an answer to say that each expounder of Scripture may do this for himself and for his audience; for, in the first place, it is highly probable that the correction of the individual will reflect some bias or some want of that many-sidedness of consideration which only several minds, working together, can be expected to exhibit. Secondly, nothing really does more dishonor to the Inspired Word than to leave it confessedly in a state in which there is practically a sort of standing invitation to the ordinary preacher to correct before his audience what he himself would probably designate as our "otherwise admirable version." It is no use saying that

the corrections needed will not affect great principles, or that no errors have been produced, as a speaker at York expressed it, "inconsistent with the truth of God." There *are* errors in our translation which involve such inconsistency, and involve it, too, in the way in which vital truths are most seriously affected, viz., by the *inferences* drawn from the written words. Suppose it be true, though even this we do not concede, that there is no obvious error in our version, whether in the text or in the translation, affecting any distinct definition of doctrine, yet can any one, with the most moderate knowledge of theology, undertake to deny that a great number of current deductions, commonly made and commonly accepted, affecting such vital doctrines as the doctrine of personal salvation and the doctrine of the last things—what is technically called soteriology and eschatology—rest upon mistranslations of words and misconceptions in exegesis, which might be greatly reduced, if not wholly removed, by a fair and scholarly revision? There are favorite proof-texts, as the Bishop of St. David's pointed out with his usual acuteness, though, as we subsequently learn from him, to his own great personal inconvenience, which would certainly disappear from their present prominence in current homiletical teaching. There are passages, not few in number, which revision would certainly relieve from much of their present servitude of misuse in religious controversy. It really would form a just subject for wonder that perhaps the greater portion of those who are loyally attached, even to extreme views as to verbal inspiration, are now found among the opponents to revision, if the reason were not intelligible and somewhat easy to divine. When we simply call to mind the many passages in which certain shades of certain opinions, not in the original words nor in the context, were still permitted to linger—if indeed, here and there, they were not introduced—we may perhaps cease to be surprised at the almost passionate language with which all attempts to exhibit with greater faithfulness the real mind of the inspired original are deprecated and con-

demned. The truth is often unpalatable, and we fear it may be so in this case, but the fact is certain—some extreme views, especially in reference to some deeper doctrines, would lose some amount of the support which they now find in the translated words of the English Version of the New Testament, if those words were fairly reconsidered by impartial and competent scholars.

Real weight of the argument of faithfulness.

If this be so, then the counter-argument of faithfulness comes back to us again with increased force. At any rate, be this as it may, the counter-argument must ever be fully borne in mind before we enter into the objections. With some minds, the duty of faithfulness to God's Word will outweigh every other consideration; and with most minds it will be admitted to be an antecedent argument which, at any rate, requires enhanced force in the arguments on the other side. Most people very quickly assume that revision is a sort of professional matter, and that the advocacy of it only arises from some commingled desire of presenting the sacred documents in a better form, and at the same time of airing our scholarship, and never seriously consider that with some it is a matter of deepest moment, and that it appeals to the most conscientious convictions, as to Christian duty and Christian faithfulness, that can be found in any heart. On this subject there should be no mistake. With all those who seriously advocate combined and authoritative revision it is a question of *simple duty*. They are persuaded that the Church, "the pillar and ground of the truth," the guardian of the inspired archives, and the transmitter of them to her children, is bound to give them to those children in the purest and truest form, and that the Convocation of the Southern Province has only done her duty in moving in this holy cause without any reference to the popular arguments of prejudice or expediency.

With a recognition then, at any rate, of the deep convictions of those who are now moving for a revision of the present Version of the Holy Scriptures, and especially of the

New Testament, let us now soberly consider the three objections which we have already specified.

First objection considered.

The first argument, that a revision of the Scripture would tend to unsettle men's minds, and shake their faith in the inspired Word itself, is, we regret to write it, the weakest of the three arguments. It was a fairly valid objection no more than a few years back, but, alas! it has ceased to be one now. It sounded fairly convincing in the House of Commons some thirteen or fourteen years ago, from the mouth of a minister of the crown, in answer to an ill-considered proposal of one who scarcely could be considered an authority on such a subject. Approbation probably was given to the answer; but would that approbation be given now? Nay, would any minister of the crown ever dream of using such a counter-argument now? No; faith, not merely in the words and expressions of Scripture, but in its very historical foundation, has of late been so seriously shaken, that few could be found who in any popular assembly could expect such an argument would be deemed now to have any real weight. What would verbal changes, often very trivial, at the rate of one a verse, amount to, in regard of unsettling men's minds, when compared with the earthquake-like movements which have taken place since the last-mentioned argument was used in the House of Commons? In an age that has welcomed *Essays and Reviews*, and passionately praised such a semi-Socinian treatise as *Ecce Homo*, we must feel that such an objection as this can not possibly be admitted to hold any place. Even if it were to be urged in reference to those who at present have not seriously felt the movement to which we have alluded—the pure, tender, and loving souls that yet believe with all the trust and devotion of the days that are now no more, it would hardly have much weight, as it would be balanced by the consideration that we should tend most to reassure such spirits by showing to them, by the very facts of the revision, how blessed a heritage was the English Bible, and how little heed was to be paid to at-

tempts to vilify it. Instead of being liable to the insidious advance of apprehensions that the English Bible was not to be relied on as a faithful translation, they would see ultimately what little change, even in an age of doubt as well as of advanced scholarship, was deemed necessary to be made in the Volume they loved so well. Far from unsettling, we are convinced that a wise and authoritative revision would at the present time act exactly in the contrary way, and that it would probably tend, more than can now even be imagined, to tranquillize and to reassure.

Second objection considered.

The second objection is of greater weight, but there are several countervailing considerations which it is desirable not to leave unnoticed. In the first place, the alterations that would probably be introduced would almost certainly be very limited both in number and in degree. When made, however, they would generally be found to be clear and even necessary improvements. If, then, we are to make the extreme assumption that Nonconformists as a body would be likely publicly to disavow the revised Volume, we must not fail to observe that they would thus find themselves committed to a disavowal of a certain number of corrections which every scholar in the world would pronounce necessary, if the duty of faithfulness to God's Word is in any degree to be accepted as a principle. But, in the second place, there is no reason whatever for thinking that Nonconformists would act in such a narrow spirit; nay, there is positive evidence to the contrary. This very year opened with a very able article in the January number of the *British Quarterly* on the subject of revision, from which it is perfectly clear that all the more intelligent Nonconformists not only would interpose no sectarian obstacles, but would even readily take their part in the great work, if invited by competent authority, and on the equal terms of common scholarship. The subject has also been noticed in several of the public organs of the different dissenting bodies, and in none, so far as they have fallen under our observation, in other than tem-

perate and even favorable terms. Just views seem to be entertained of the nature of the work, and no indications have yet appeared of any desire to gain party triumphs by assaults on received ecclesiastical terms, or by changes in the existing religious vocabulary. A few years ago it was different. Able writers like Marsh* seemed to consider it impossible for revisers of different denominations to act in proper concert, and have used, at a period no farther back than 1861, the strongest language as to the hopelessness of united action. It is just, however, to the intelligent critic whose name has been mentioned, to add, that he expressed a belief that a time certainly was coming when there might be such an increase in harmony and in knowledge as to make a union in revision a possibility.

And we verily believe that the time is now close at hand.

Churchmen willing to co-operate.

Not only is there an apparent willingness in Nonconformists to take part in the work, but there is clear evidence on the part of the Church that she is fully prepared to ask for their aid and co-operation. No clearer proof can be given of this than the recommendations of an important committee of the Southern Convocation which have been recently accepted by both houses, and we trust will shortly be acted upon.† There the readiness to co-operate is specified in clear and authoritative words.

* See *Lectures on the English Language*, p. 641.

† The resolutions referred to are as follows:

"1. That it is desirable that a revision of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken.

"2. That the revision be so conducted as to comprise both marginal renderings, and such emendations as it may be found necessary to insert in the text of the Authorized Version.

"3. That in the above resolutions we do not contemplate any new translation of the Bible, or any alteration of the language, except where, in the judgment of the most competent scholars, such change is necessary.

"4. That in such necessary changes, the style of the language employed in the existing version be closely followed.

"5. That it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong."

Example of co-operation. The Tamil Version.

But, in the third place, it may be observed that not only are there these evidences on either side of willingness to co-operate in making yet more perfect the translation of our common Bible, but there are actual examples of the work having been done in perfect harmony, in the case of translations of the Scripture into foreign languages for missionary purposes. A very striking instance of this has been recently given by the completion of the Tamil Version. This very important work has now been finished, after more than eleven years of united labor, in which missionaries from the Church of England have worked in perfect harmony with missionaries from other religious bodies. In the narrative of their labors which has lately been published* there are no traces of those dissensions on ecclesiastical words which recent writers in newspapers have confidently predicted will be the case at home. No notices, or even hints of any sectarian difficulties, which certainly might have been expected to show themselves in a new work, and in a period so long as eleven

---

The names of the committee who were appointed to draw up the report are as follows: Bishop of Winchester, Bishop of St. David's, Bishop of Llandaff, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, Bishop of Ely, Bishop of Lincoln, Bishop of Salisbury, Bishop of Bath and Wells, The Prolocutor (Dr. Bickersteth), Dean of Canterbury (Dr. Alford), Dean of Westminster (Dr. Stanley), Dean of Lincoln (Dr. Jeremie), Archdeacon of Bedford (Mr. Rose), Archdeacon of Exeter (Mr. Freeman), Archdeacon of Rochester and St. Alban's (Dr. Grant), Chancellor Massingberd, Canon Blakesley, Canon How, Canon Selwyn, Canon Swainson, Canon Woodgate, Dr. Jebb, Dr. Kay, and Mr. De Winton. We are glad now to subjoin that the report was accepted unanimously by the Upper House, and with substantial unanimity by the Lower House. A committee has been appointed, consisting of eight bishops and eight presbyters, to take the necessary steps for giving effect to the resolutions. The committee consists of the eleven names first specified in the above list, and those of the Archdeacon of Bedford, Canon Blakesley, Canon Selwyn, Dr. Jebb, and Dr. Kay.

* See the very interesting account of this important work recently published by the Bible Society. This pamphlet is especially commended to the attention of the impartial reader. It is singularly illustrative of many of our supposed present difficulties, and shows how, by the blessing of the Holy Ghost, they have been surmounted by the earnest and faithful men who took part in the work.

years, find any place in the interesting pamphlet which gives the record of the progress and completion of the labors. The men did their work on the basis of Tamil scholarship, and with a true sense of their responsibilities, and they have been permitted to bring their faithful labors to a successful close. And as it has been with them, so we are persuaded it will now be among ourselves. The bonds will be reverence for God's Word and God's truth, and sound and practiced scholarship; and these will be found too strong even for religious prejudices, if indeed they are to be considered as likely to be shown by men of disciplined minds in matters of English and Hellenic grammar and criticism. Again and again must the general reader be reminded of the great difference between a commentary and a revision. The former work could not be executed by such a mixed body as is now under consideration; the latter certainly could, because the appeal would lie in all cases to scholarship; and here, thank God, there is neither High-Church nor Low-Church, neither conformity nor dissent. If the mass of general readers could once be persuaded of this simple fact—that the more accurate the scholarship, the more tolerant and charitable are men found to be *when in co-operation*, we should hear far less gloomy anticipations of the animosities and ruptures that we are told would show themselves in a mixed body of scholars of differing religious persuasions. But those who indulge in such anticipations are not scholars, and have never done an hour's work of revision in co-operation with others. Their words, however, have some power to do harm.

We may come to the conclusion, then, that there is not, at the present time at any rate, much force in the second objection. A few years back it would have had much weight, but these few years have brought with them many changes both for good and for evil. The utmost that can be urged is that a revised version might not win its way by equal rates of progress among churchmen and dissenters, but the anticipation that there would be a Church Bible and a Dissenter's

Bible is really an anticipation only fit for a commonplace in a popular speech, or an argument in a newspaper letter.

Relation to colonial churches and America.

The question of our relation to the American and colonial churches is very different, and confessedly is not without its difficulties. These two considerations, however, go far to modify them: first, that the changes will, as we have shown, probably be few; and, secondly, that there will not be any antecedent jealousies and prejudices (such as between the Church and Dissent) which could hinder the changes being accepted, if really good. The result probably will be, that any changes that ultimately obtain full acceptance at home will very readily be adopted both by the American and colonial churches. The question will really turn on the amount and nature of the changes. If they are few and good, they will be accepted; if not, they will not meet with acceptance either at home or abroad.

The third objection belongs to the future.

The third objection is perhaps the most important of the three, but it is one which, by the nature of the case, it is not very easy to meet. We are transferred into the future, and have very few data derived from the past on which to hazard a forecast. Former revisions certainly succeeded each other after no lengthened intervals, but then they were revisions which were suggested by the existing state of the translation and the changeful character of the times. We have now, as all are ready to admit, a thoroughly good, though not a perfect translation. It has maintained its ground in its present form for 260 years. It has secured a firm hold on the affections of the people. It has become also a sort of literary monument of which every Englishman and every English critic of eminence (if we except a few ill-natured remarks of Mr. Hallam*) is justly proud. These are facts which certainly seem to suggest the persuasion that one cautious and reverent retouching of the old picture might be tolerated, but that all parties, after they had accepted the work—and this it would take time to bring

* See his *Literature of Europe*, vol. ii., p. 58, Harper & Brothers, N. York.

about—would very distinctly concur in deprecating any farther manipulations. The really *monumental* character of our version is its best protection against progressive change, and this protection, we can not help feeling persuaded, as long as England is England, will be always found available and sufficient.

Faithfulness requires the work.

But, as we have already said, these are but forecasts in answer to forecasts. Different thinkers would probably come to different conclusions. Bias, again, may influence very seriously our predictions and anticipations. So it may be best, perhaps, to leave the objection as we find it, and rather to put on the other side what many feel to be their bounden duty, viz., to place before our people God's truth in as faithful a form as the nature of the work permits. If there are errors, they ought to be removed for the truth's sake. If there are inaccuracies which give false tinges to deduced doctrines, surely we seem called upon to revise them now, whatever may be done in the future, in accordance with the known and, for the most part, fixed principles of grammar and scholarship. Surely, whatever may be our anticipations of future proceedings, whatever our hopes of farther discoveries, we do seem bound, for very thankfulness, to take the critical aid that has been so mysteriously extended to us, and with the Sinaitic Manuscript, and the vast accumulated knowledge of other manuscripts that has of late been made available, to prepare ourselves reverently to bring up our English Testament to that standard of correctness which is now clearly attainable.

If this is the duty of the present, then we must be content to leave the morrow to be careful for the things of itself. We might justly have been anxious if the amount of change had seemed likely to have been greater than we have now found it likely to be. After the estimate we have formed, and the results arrived at, when taken in combination with the calls of duty to which we have just adverted, it does seem proper, whatever the future may be, cautiously and

reverently to go forward, and if the third objection weighs with us, to set now an example to the future of our circumspectness, our sense of responsibility, and our guarded reverence for England's greatest treasure. The nature of our action now may exercise vast influence on the future; nay, it may not only give the tone to all changes in days yet to come, but may prevent rash and sweeping changes, which inaction, at the present time, may only too probably bring about.

So let us reverently and cautiously go forward, and now, lastly, consider how and in what manner we may best pursue our onward way. The consideration of this question will form the subject of our concluding chapter.

## CHAPTER VII.

### BEST MANNER OF PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK.

We may now suitably bring our considerations to a close by a few remarks on the authority under which it would seem best that a revision of the Holy Scriptures should be undertaken, and on the most hopeful mode of proceeding with the actual work.

Convocation the proper authority for the work.

In reference to the first question—the authority under which the work should be undertaken—we have now happily, and we may also rightly say providentially, no necessity for any lengthened comments. The question has recently, and even subsequently to the printing of the early pages of this work, been answered for us. The Convocation of Canterbury has not only given its weighty approval to the undertaking, but has also appointed a committee of sixteen men,* with power to add to their number, to make a beginning, and in due time to place some specimens of their work before Convocation and the nation at large. That committee will have met and decided on its future plan

* The names have been specified above; see the note on p. 159. In reference to this number of sixteen, it is right here to notice the wisdom and forbearance shown by the Lower House. Several of our readers may know that when a joint commission of both houses of Convocation is appointed, it is customary for the number appointed from the Lower House to be double that from the Upper. In the present case, however, on its being pointed out that so large a body as sixteen, in addition to the eight bishops, would practically much limit the numbers that could be co-opted from the general company of Biblical scholars not belonging to Convocation (the committee otherwise being likely to become utterly unwieldy), the Lower House, alike with good sense and good feeling, accepted the suggestion that the number from their body should be reduced to the same number as that from the Upper House. See the recent debates in Convocation, and the very sensible speech of Lord Alwyne Compton in *The Guardian* for May 18, p. 585.

of operations before these lines will come before the eye of the reader.

So the Convocation of Canterbury has taken up the great and national work. Yes, the work is marked out, and some of the future laborers are already called forth to commence it. At such a time and in such a cause, is it too much humbly to ask that the prayers of all those that love the Word of God in sincerity may constantly be offered up for all those who, in these anxious times, either are now or hereafter shall be called to take part in the work, and who, in the prosecution of that work, will need all the support that such prayers are especially permitted to minister?

Convocation has undertaken the work; and with this issue many at first will be, and will probably avow themselves to be, utterly dissatisfied. Such a work, they will urge, ought to have been committed to a royal commission; the highest earthly authority in this realm should have summoned together the revisers of the future, and assigned to them their duties and their work. The national treasure should have been intrusted to men chosen out from the nation at large, not to the members of an antiquated body, and to the precarious aid that might be extended to them by those who are without. Such thoughts are natural, and such thoughts will find public expression, but they will not be, after all, the thoughts of the sober observers of the days in which we now are living; they will not be the expressions of those who best and most intelligently appreciate the mighty changes which each year that is passing is now silently bringing with it. Convocation is really the best authority under which such a work could be undertaken, and (not to mention others) for this one, simple, and homely reason, that what we want is a revised version, and not an improved version; and that the latter would almost certainly be the result of the labors of *such* a royal commission as would inevitably be called to the work in these present days. It would be constructed, almost certainly, on the principle of including all representative men

who had any sufficient claim to scholarship, and a very representative version would such a body most assuredly produce. No, we may be certainly thankful that those who stand highest in the national councils have shown no disposition to encourage these ambitious and ultimately self-frustrating designs. We may almost trace the providential ordering of God in the turn that the Revision Question has lately taken. We have now, at any rate, no fear of an over-corrected version. The men now appointed, and those who will be invited to join them, will all feel alike, that they are entering upon a work in which that which will most commend them to public favor will be *the least possible amount of change consistent with faithfulness.** A royal commission would conceive itself to be independent, and would act accordingly. A body, constituted as the body of revisers now will be constituted, will have soberly to consult public religious feeling. It will always have before it this plain fact—that their work can only hope to take the place of the venerable version now in our hands by being that version, not only generally and substantially, but that version in all its details save only those where amending hands may have removed some scattered errors and imperfections. Such a body will, by the very nature of the case, even independently of those higher principles by which it will, beyond all doubt, be influenced, know perfectly well that, to achieve any success, it must labor patiently, vigilantly, and sympathizingly; and such a knowledge will act as a healthy incentive. It will only have itself and its own efforts to trust to. To succeed is really little more than its very condition of existence. To fail is to be disbanded and dissipated.

When we thus soberly consider the problem and the proposed mode of solving it, we can hardly doubt that even those who may at first have felt the strongest prejudice against a so-called national work being attempted by members of the Convocation of Canterbury (and we hope, ultimately, of York)

* See the comments in *The Times* for May 6, already referred to on p. 86. This will probably be one of the leading rules.

and those scholars who may be invited to join them, will in the end admit that it is best that matters should have taken this their present and almost unlooked-for turn. We may honestly even more than acquiesce in the present arrangement, and wish all concerned in it a hearty God-speed.

The future of the work uncertain.

Of course, at present many things are uncertain, and must be considered as yet in the realm of hope rather than that of knowledge and experience. We can not tell confidently to what extent those without will join in the work,* nor, if they do join, can we certainly predict that all will act together with easiness and harmony. We can not be sure that they may not all be disposed to attempt a far more sweeping revision than the Church and even nation would tolerate. We dare not confidently say that they may not begin with caution and moderation, and be accelerated into innovation. All such things are possible; but we may reasonably have hope, and even well-grounded hope, that it will be otherwise, and that both Conformity and Nonconformity will act in this matter both wisely and fraternally, and will

* It is especially cheering to observe that the practical invitation of Convocation to those who are not members of the Church of England has been responded to in the spirit in which it was given. The writer of a thoroughly friendly article in *The Freeman* of May 13 expresses the hope that "Nonconformists will not be slow to respond to any invitation to co-operate in the task inaugurated by Convocation," and closes his remarks with the following wise and conciliatory words: "We earnestly hope that, should any of our number be summoned to the assistance of the Committee of Convocation, they will immediately respond. Their task is simplified by the determination to revise, and not to re-translate. A new translation would raise the vexed question of the rendering of the words which relate to baptism. Revision, we conclude, leaves that question where it was. In any case, fidelity to the original text must be the ruling principle, and he that hath the Divine Word in the language in which it was originally written should give it faithfully, in its exact equivalent, to the English-speaking peoples of the world. We wish the enterprise the divine blessing and acceptance with the churches, and counsel our readers to follow the wise and liberal lead of the bishops (whose recommendations we cordially indorse) in the proposed revision of the English version of the Bible." It may be remarked that we had ourselves anticipated this very expression of opinion, and had ventured positively to say for Baptist scholars what is here said by themselves. See above, p. 83, note *, which was written prior to the words here quoted.

only vie with each other in reverent solicitude to do faithfully that which they have been called to undertake, and in that wise fear and trembling with which the devout scholar of the nineteenth century should approach the revision of the noblest version of the written words of patriarchs, prophets, evangelists, and apostles that the world has ever known.

We may now pass, secondly and lastly, to a brief consideration of the manner in which the work should be undertaken and performed.

The work should be done together.

The chief principles have already been laid down in the foregoing pages. We have already specified the leading canons which reflection and experience alike seem to suggest as the fundamental rules that must be followed in a work such as that to which we are now definitely pledged. These we have already seen are, *First*, that the work must be done round a common table. Mind must act on mind; thought on thought. We must have no ambitious schemes of collecting opinions by correspondence or otherwise, unless those collected opinions are to be discussed by the gathered body of revisers. We must not delegate to any small committee the work of consolidating or harmonizing the opinions of the many that may with profit be called into counsel. No; both the revisers of the Old and of the New Testament respectively must do their work together, and discuss not only their own proposals, but also all the suggestions of others, in their own common rooms of council. On this, taught by experience, we lay the greatest stress. And not only the present, but the past confirms this view. We have seen that, in a great degree, the success of our present Authorized Version was due to co-operative union, and that the points in which it partially failed, viz., consistency of renderings, and harmony in the application of grammatical principles, are just those points in which a system which gave the New Testament to two different companies, under two different chairmen, might beforehand be expected to fail. But if we thus press for union in work, we also insist, with equal

earnestness, on the necessity of individual labor in private. To make such a union a truly co-operative union, every member of it would have to work privately as well as publicly. Each scholar belonging to the body would of course come with his corrections carefully made in private, reconsidered, and formally committed to writing. With these he would take his place at the council-table, and these he would compare with the corrections similarly made by the rest of his brethren. The changes ultimately agreed upon would be the result of the comparison, and of the discussion which each item in the comparison would be liable to call out. Many corrections would be found to have been made by the majority, and would at once be accepted by all present; others would require consideration; a certain portion would call out discussion, and could only be finally settled by a formal vote.

While, then, we thus urge, as the first principle, co-operative union, we not the less insist upon *previous and formal preparation in private*, so as to concentrate attention on what might seem, on deliberation, to require it, and to obviate all improper waste of time in discussion of mere proposals of the moment.

Experience the best guide.

If this would seem to be our first principle, the *second* would certainly seem to be the due recognition of *experience as the surest guide*. In other words, the work at first must be done tentatively. A careful record of principles apparently arrived at, and even of renderings of passages marked by certain grammatical characteristics, *e. g.*, hypothetical sentences involving what could not or would not happen,* past participles with finite verbs, the use of

* We may give as an instance such passages as John v., 46; viii., 10, al., where we have the *imperfect* in both clauses, when contrasted with such passages as Matt. xi., 21, where both clauses have the aorist, or with such passages as Heb. iv., 8, where there is an aorist in the first clause and an imperfect in the second, or conversely, as John xiv., 28, where the imperfect is in the first clause and the aorist in the second. Let any one try to lay down a settled principle for translating these, and he will find it extremely difficult to carry it out in easy and idiomatic English. Even in the simplest case—imperfect in both clauses and aorist in both clauses—if we try always to translate the

"shall" or "shall have" in the translation of the aorist subjunctive after certain temporal particles, etc.—all would require to be noted down at the time and to be carefully registered. There would thus be a large and increasing amount of general principles which would be continually tested by actual practice, and ultimately confirmed and consolidated. With these thus acquired and thus verified, the whole work would be reconsidered, and the result thus arrived at accepted for that edition as final.

Revision should be guarded, but sufficient.

The *third* principle would be to preserve the mean between pretermission of what ought to have been corrected, and mere improvement in renderings when the necessity for the change was not distinctly appreciable. In other words, the revision would have to be alike conservative and sufficient; carried out on the general principle of the least possible change on the one hand, and yet honorably imitative of that extreme *vigilance* which (in the comparison in chap. iii. of those passages as given in our own version, with the same passages as given in Tyndale and the early versions) we have already observed to be such a special and honorable characteristic of the revision of 1611. To innovate, or what is called "improve," is a grievous mistake on the one side, but it must not be forgotten that there is a directly contrary mistake, which, if made, might lead to very unwelcome consequences. If the revision were not fairly a sufficient one, it would certainly be followed at no great length of time by another attempt, and the very evil, of which we have been forced to admit the possibility in our last chapter, would become real and actual. To use a homely simile, if we create an appetite for revision we must be careful to satisfy it. No doubt this canon is a far easier one to state than to follow. This golden mean of correcting just what ought to be corrected is excessively hard to maintain;

former by "would" and the latter by "would have" (not an unreasonable principle), we shall find many a passage that will put even this rule to a test that it will not in practice be found able successfully to bear.

still, we feel confident that if the general reasonableness and truth of this principle be fairly recognized, and if the attempt be made, as far as possible, to act on it, experience will gradually make the observance of it more and more easy and instinctive. The principle, of course, really involves all that has already been said on the limits of revision, and includes numberless degrees of application; yet we are persuaded, if once the reviser clearly appreciates the difference between a mere debatable improvement and a thoroughly necessary correction, he will be enabled, after a moderate amount of practice, to decide with approximate success in those many cases which lie on the border-land, and in the just estimate of which the strongest call is made upon the intelligence and judgment of the reviser. Our own corrections in the fifth chapter will, we have no doubt, supply the acute reader with several instances in which we ourselves have unwittingly crossed the frontier, and have introduced unnecessary corrections; still, if it be so, we shall have, at any rate, illustrated the truth of another principle, often insisted on in these pages, that no single mind can produce a thoroughly good and consistent revision.

The old vocabulary to be used.

The *fourth* principle, which it would seem most desirable carefully to observe, and in every case strictly to act upon throughout the work, has been already briefly alluded to in the introductory chapter, and may now be stated more fully and precisely. It relates to the language and vocabulary to be used in the corrections and alterations that may be introduced, and it may be expressed as follows: In corrections, limit the choice of words to *the vocabulary of the present version* combined with that of the versions that preceded it;* and in alterations, preserve as far

* It seems desirable especially to include the earlier versions, with the caution only that the Rhemish Version, from the peculiar nature of its language, must commonly be excepted. It is often, as has been already remarked (see p. 81), useful in its vocabulary, but so Latinized that it can only be used with the utmost caution. The other versions, especially those of Tyndale and Coverdale, may be used very freely in regard of the language in which the correc-

as possible the rhythm and cadence of the Authorized Version. This principle can not be too strongly insisted upon. It is in the choice of the words, and the juxtaposition of the words when chosen, that the success of any revision will be found in a great degree to depend, and for these three reasons: the revised version must be a popular version; it must also be a version that reads well, and can be *heard* with the old and familiar pleasure with which our present version is always listened to; it must, thirdly, be such that no consciousness of novelty of turn or expression is awakened in the mind of hearer or reader. In a word, we must never be reminded that we are not hearing the old version, and must only be brought to perceive the revision when we read it over thoughtfully in private. Such a result can only be obtained by making the correction in words chosen out of (so to speak) a strictly Biblical vocabulary, and also by the mechanical but very necessary proceeding of having each chapter, when completed, read aloud, slowly and continuously, by one of the body of revisers to his assembled brethren. Many a correction which the eye and inward feeling might have been willing to accept will be beneficially challenged by the simple yet subtle process of the hearing of the outward ear. This very homely suggestion will be found of some practical usefulness.

Vote not to be hurried.

The *fifth* principle is more one of detail, but still it seems to involve in it so much of common sense and practical wisdom that it perhaps deserves a place among the leading principles we are now specifying, and it may be stated in the following rule: In every passage where there may be distinct differences of opinion, and decided expressions of it, *reserve the taking of the vote thereon* till the beginning of the next meeting. Let the arguments for the

tions are to be clothed. Frequently they will be found to contain the very alteration we might wish to introduce, and herein we shall supplement the work of 1611. The translators of that day were bidden to revert to the older versions, but it has been already observed that they did this very imperfectly. See p. 80, and Westcott, *History of the English Bible*, p. 339.

different renderings be fully stated and concluded at the prior meeting, so that nothing remains but the decision between two or more competing corrections; but let that decision, as we have said, be made at the subsequent meeting, after time has been taken for private reconsideration, and after every trace of that slight irritation which is often called out in the very best of us by opposing argument and by the keenness of discussion has entirely disappeared. It should be a fixed rule that the discussion should not be reopened when the vote is taken, unless with the consent of two thirds, as otherwise the very evil which this rule is designed to repress would be again called into existence and operation. Such a rule requires but few comments to recommend it. It is based on the recognition of some amount of poor human infirmity, which, in such a calm and holy work as the revision of the Scriptures, should ever be sensitively provided against. There should be no tinge of temper or party spirit in any correction, however slight, that may hereafter find its place on the pages of the English Bible.

Our *sixth* principle relates to the use of the *margin*, and is founded on a due recognition of the importance of two practical opposing considerations. On the one hand, we have already distinctly expressed the opinion, and have acted upon it in more than one passage of the sample revisions in a foregoing chapter, that in a doubtful passage the present rendering should be maintained, unless there was a distinct preponderance of argument and authority against it, and that the competing rendering should be placed in the margin. On the other hand, no principle seems more distinctly to commend itself to us than this, that the margin should not, in the general judgment of scholars, be considered to be exegetically or critically superior to the text.* Such is the judgment commonly entertained in refer-

Text should always be better than margin.

* It is with some degree of regret that we observe that the Bishop of Lincoln, in his recent speech in Convocation (see *Guardian* for May 11, p. 550), still advocates what, we have seen, he recommended in Convocation thirteen

ence to our present margin; such certainly should not be the judgment of scholars and divines in reference to the margin of the future. But how can we harmonize these partially conflicting considerations? How can we combine conservatism with loyalty to the calm decision of an intelligent majority? Perhaps thus: *First*, by considering each existing marginal rendering as *so nearly of the same authority* as that of the text, that if the majority, even by a single vote,* decided for the margin, the margin and the text should at once change places. *Secondly*, in cases where there may be no marginal rendering, by providing that some fixed proportion of votes, for example two thirds, should always be required before any portion of the present version should *finally* be displaced, whether to be transferred to the margin or no. The transference to the margin would obviously apply only to cases of real importance, and in which all would agree, whichever side they might take, that the alternative rendering

years ago. See above, p. 15, note *. There is nothing we may more justly deprecate than any plan which might contemplate placing the corrections that may be proposed *in the margin*. Any plan more likely to invite imperfectly considered corrections can hardly be conceived. It would, in fact, be thoroughly to misuse the margin; it would give (if the bishop's suggestions were adopted) very undesirable liberty to individual ministers, viz., as to whether they would read publicly the text or the margin, and it would also at once relieve the revisers of a large portion of that deep feeling of *responsibility* which a continual remembrance that what they are recommending is *for the text* would be certain to bring with it. How soberly and how thoughtfully men would form their decisions when those decisions were to settle (if their revision was accepted) what was ultimately to take the place of the present words, and hereafter to be read publicly as a portion of the Book of Life.

* We may illustrate this by an instance in one of the two sample portions of the Authorized Version which we have revised in chap. v. In Romans viii., 27, it is doubtful whether ὅτι is causal or simply demonstrative; whether, in fact, it is to be translated "because" or "that." Here the A.V. places the second of these two translations in the margin. On the principle, then, above laid down, a bare majority would be entitled to take this latter translation if they thought fit. They perhaps would take it, as the clause really does not strictly contain the reason for the assertion in the foregoing clause, but seems rather to explain more precisely what is just before stated generally, namely, that He "maketh intercession, etc." So Grotius and Estius, and, among more recent expositors, Fritzsche, Meyer, Reiche, and others.

ought specially to be recorded. On a final revision, then, two thirds might with profit be required in reference to all differences from the A.V., but in a *first* revision the decision of a simple majority should always be allowed to prevail.* No committee would be wise to begin their work with self-tied hands. Reverence, experience, and, let us not fail to add, prayer for spiritual guidance, would always be found to be of more avail than elaborate rules, which the stress of practice and the diversity of circumstances would soon show to be utterly nugatory. Such a body as the revisers should be jealously careful to reserve to themselves all proper freedom. Rules and canons are good, but elasticity is better, and in no undertaking that can readily be conceived will elasticity be found a more necessary element than in the translation of Scripture or the revision of translations already made. Elasticity is the characteristic of every version from the days of Tyndale down to the date of the last revision, and elasticity must be the characteristic of the revised version of the future, if it is ever to displace or even rival the fresh, vigorous, and genuinely idiomatic translation that bears the honored name of the Authorized Version.

Follow the spirit of the old rules.

The *seventh* and last principle may be very briefly stated, and conveniently embodied in the following recommendation, viz., that, *mutatis mutandis*, the revisers of our own day should consider themselves as bound by the spirit of the rules laid down for the guidance of the translators of 1611. In several points they might even be bound by the letter; but, as the circumstances are different,

* We do here earnestly repeat the hope, already expressed in substance in an earlier portion of this work (see p. 30), that the judgment of the ancient versions will especially be considered. In doubtful cases, and where the grammatical and exegetical arguments are very nearly in equipoise, the judgment of the early versions is of great moment. Every pains, therefore, should be taken to ascertain their opinions, and those opinions ought to be accounted as votes of a very prerogative character. Great weight may also justly be laid on the express decisions of the *Greek* fathers. The deliberate opinion of men who spoke the language of the New Testament can not fail to exercise considerable influence on the judgment of every sober interpreter.

and the problem now to be solved not perfectly the same as it was then, it would seem enough to suggest a loyal adherence to the *spirit* of the rules, and especially a careful imitation of the manner in which those rules were applied. To say more would be to pass into details which have either been already noticed and illustrated in the foregoing pages, or which can only properly be discussed when all the varied exigencies of the work shall have displayed themselves in actual practice. The rules of the revision of 1611 may form the basis for the rules of the new revision, but they must be read subject to the inherent differences between the work of the past and the work of the future. The former revisers had to deal with a version of but moderate pretensions (the Bishops' Bible), and but doubtfully holding its own against its Genevan rival. The revisers of these days have to deal with a version of the highest possible strain, and that deservedly stands unique and unapproached. It may be wise, then, for our present revisers to avail themselves of the wisdom of past rules, but it must nearly always be rather in the newness of their spirit than in the oldness of the letter.

To sum up all, then, in a single sentence, we would respectfully and deferentially say to the learned and faithful men that will shortly address themselves to this great undertaking, *Do your work together; consider experience your truest guide; don't try to "improve" our present version, but be satisfied with correcting it; use the old words, and have an ear for the old rhythm; don't decide till afterthought has exercised its due influence; make the text better than the margin;* and, lastly, *follow the spirit of the old rules.*

Conclusion.

We may now close this chapter, and with it the present work. There are numberless details which might yet be specified. There are many suggestions, only partially developed, which perhaps it might not be wholly out of place to specify in a chapter that has for its heading The best Manner of Proceeding with the Work. But all these things we may now leave to the learned body of men who either have

been or are about to be called to the important work. Let us trust all details to their wisdom and faithfulness, and support them by our prayers. Their work is arduous; much is expected from them; the object at which they are aiming is almost discouragingly high: success is what is demanded of them, and implied in the very fact of their being called together; failure is an individual as well as a collective reproach. Yes, the work *is* arduous. Never, since the last revision, have scholars and theologians girded up their loins to a work in which more faithfulness was required in preparation; more vigilance in execution; more patience in discussing; more wisdom in discerning; more sobriety in judging. Never, during the two centuries and a half that have now passed away, has English learning and good sense been called upon to submit themselves to a severer test. Never was there a work in which could be needed, not only for the general body, but for every individual member of it, more patient energy, deeper humility, and a fuller sense of duty and responsibility.

Let us pray, then, for our revisers and their work. Let us pray that their work may bring a blessing to this Church and nation, and make wiser unto salvation not only us at home, but all those that speak our common tongue—those countless thousands whose inner and spiritual life the decisions of these revisers may affect, and whose knowledge of God's message to mankind their deliberations may be permitted to further. But those results are not yet. That future is still distant. Even with the most prospered issues, a generation must pass away ere the labors of the present time will be so far recognized as to take the place of the labors of the past. The youngest scholar that may be called upon to bear his part in the great undertaking will have fallen on sleep before the labors in which he may have shared will be regarded as fully bearing their hoped-for fruit. The latest survivor of the gathered company will be resting in the calm of Paradise ere the work at which he toiled will meet with

the reception which, by the blessing of God the Holy Ghost, it may ultimately be found to deserve. The bread will be cast upon the waters, but it will not be found till after many days.

And it is good that it should be so. Such work as the revision of the noblest version of the Word of God that this world holds is not for the fleeting praise or blame of contemporaries, but for the calm judgment of the holy and the wise in distant days and generations yet to come. . . . With such mingled feelings, with these humbly implied aspirations on the one hand, and these chastening remembrances on the other—with the quickest sense of frailty and weakness, and yet with the consciousness of deepest responsibility, let our revisers now address themselves to their work, and in the end all may be well. Let us remember that our best and highest powers are vouchsafed to us in this world only for labor while it is day, but let us also verily remember that such labor, if faithfully bestowed, will abide, for that on which it is to be bestowed is changeless and eternal. ALL FLESH IS GRASS, AND ALL THE GLORY OF MAN AS THE FLOWER OF GRASS. THE GRASS WITHERETH, AND THE FLOWER THEREOF FALLETH AWAY, BUT THE WORD OF THE LORD ENDURETH FOREVER.

THE END.

# VALUABLE STANDARD WORKS

## FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LIBRARIES,

### PUBLISHED BY HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

☞ *For a full List of Books suitable for Libraries, see* HARPER & BROTHERS' TRADE-LIST *and* CATALOGUE, *which may be had gratuitously on application to the Publishers personally, or by letter enclosing Five Cents.*

☞ HARPER & BROTHERS *will send any of the following works by mail, postage prepaid, to any part of the United States, on receipt of the price.*

---

MOTLEY'S DUTCH REPUBLIC. The Rise of the Dutch Republic. By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY, LL.D., D.C.L. With a Portrait of William of Orange. 3 vols., 8vo, Cloth, $10 50.

MOTLEY'S UNITED NETHERLANDS. History of the United Netherlands: from the Death of William the Silent to the Twelve Years' Truce—1609. With a full View of the English-Dutch Struggle against Spain, and of the Origin and Destruction of the Spanish Armada. By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY, LL.D., D.C.L. Portraits. 4 vols., 8vo, Cloth, $14 00.

NAPOLEON'S LIFE OF CÆSAR. The History of Julius Cæsar. By His Imperial Majesty NAPOLEON III. Two Volumes ready. Library Edition, 8vo, Cloth, $3 50 per vol.

*Maps to Vols. I. and II. sold separately. Price* $1 50 *each*, NET.

HAYDN'S DICTIONARY OF DATES, relating to all Ages and Nations. For Universal Reference. Edited by BENJAMIN VINCENT, Assistant Secretary and Keeper of the Library of the Royal Institution of Great Britain; and Revised for the Use of American Readers. 8vo, Cloth, $5 00; Sheep, $6 00.

MACGREGOR'S ROB ROY ON THE JORDAN. The Rob Roy on the Jordan, Nile, Red Sea, and Gennesareth, &c. A Canoe Cruise in Palestine and Egypt, and the Waters of Damascus. By J. MACGREGOR, M.A. With Maps and Illustrations. Crown 8vo, Cloth, $2 50.

WALLACE'S MALAY ARCHIPELAGO. The Malay Archipelago: the Land of the Orang-Utan and the Bird of Paradise. A Narrative of Travel, 1854–1862. With Studies of Man and Nature. By ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE. With Ten Maps and Fifty-one Elegant Illustrations. Crown 8vo, Cloth, $3 50.

WHYMPER'S ALASKA. Travel and Adventure in the Territory of Alaska, formerly Russian America—now Ceded to the United States—and in various other parts of the North Pacific. By FREDERICK WHYMPER. With Map and Illustrations. Crown 8vo, Cloth, $2 50.

ORTON'S ANDES AND THE AMAZON. The Andes and the Amazon; or, Across the Continent of South America. By JAMES ORTON, M.A., Professor of Natural History in Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., and Corresponding Member of the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia. With a New Map of Equatorial America and numerous Illustrations. Crown 8vo, Cloth, $2 00.

WINCHELL'S SKETCHES OF CREATION. Sketches of Creation: a Popular View of some of the Grand Conclusions of the Sciences in reference to the History of Matter and of Life. Together with a Statement of the Intimations of Science respecting the Primordial Condition and the Ultimate Destiny of the Earth and the Solar System. By ALEXANDER WINCHELL, LL.D., Professor of Geology, Zoology, and Botany in the University of Michigan, and Director of the State Geological Survey. With Illustrations. 12mo, Cloth, $2 00.

WHITE'S MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW. The Massacre of St. Bartholomew: Preceded by a History of the Religious Wars in the Reign of Charles IX. By HENRY WHITE, M.A. With Illustrations. 8vo, Cloth, $1 75.

LOSSING'S FIELD-BOOK OF THE REVOLUTION. Pictorial Field-Book of the Revolution; or, Illustrations, by Pen and Pencil, of the History, Biography, Scenery, Relics, and Traditions of the War for Independence. By BENSON J. LOSSING. 2 vols., 8vo, Cloth, $14 00; Sheep, $15 00; Half Calf, $18 00; Full Turkey Morocco, $22 00.

LOSSING'S FIELD-BOOK OF THE WAR OF 1812. Pictorial Field-Book of the War of 1812; or, Illustrations, by Pen and Pencil, of the History, Biography, Scenery, Relics, and Traditions of the Last War for American Independence. By BENSON J. LOSSING. With several hundred Engravings on Wood, by Lossing and Barritt, chiefly from Original Sketches by the Author. 1088 pages, 8vo, Cloth, $7 00; Sheep, $8 50; Half Calf, $10 00.

ALFORD'S GREEK TESTAMENT. The Greek Testament: with a critically revised Text; a Digest of Various Readings; Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage; Prolegomena; and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary. For the Use of Theological Students and Ministers. By HENRY ALFORD, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. Vol. I., containing the Four Gospels. 944 pages, 8vo, Cloth, $6 00; Sheep, $6 50.

ABBOTT'S FREDERICK THE GREAT. The History of Frederick the Second, called Frederick the Great. By JOHN S. C. ABBOTT. Elegantly Illustrated. 8vo, Cloth, $5 00.

ABBOTT'S HISTORY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. The French Revolution of 1789, as viewed in the Light of Republican Institutions. By JOHN S. C. ABBOTT. With 100 Engravings. 8vo, Cloth, $5 00.

ABBOTT'S NAPOLEON BONAPARTE. The History of Napoleon Bonaparte. By JOHN S. C. ABBOTT. With Maps, Woodcuts, and Portraits on Steel. 2 vols., 8vo, Cloth, $10 00.

ABBOTT'S NAPOLEON AT ST. HELENA; or, Interesting Anecdotes and Remarkable Conversations of the Emperor during the Five and a Half Years of his Captivity. Collected from the Memorials of Las Casas, O'Meara, Montholon, Antommarchi, and others. By JOHN S. C. ABBOTT. With Illustrations. 8vo, Cloth, $5 00.

ADDISON'S COMPLETE WORKS. The Works of Joseph Addison, embracing the whole of the "Spectator." Complete in 3 vols., 8vo, Cloth, $6 00.

ALCOCK'S JAPAN. The Capital of the Tycoon: a Narrative of a Three Years' Residence in Japan. By Sir RUTHERFORD ALCOCK, K.C.B., Her Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary in Japan. With Maps and Engravings. 2 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $3 50.

ALISON'S HISTORY OF EUROPE. FIRST SERIES: From the Commencement of the French Revolution, in 1789, to the Restoration of the Bourbons, in 1815. [In addition to the Notes on Chapter LXXVI., which correct the errors of the original work concerning the United States, a copious Analytical Index has been appended to this American edition.] SECOND SERIES: From the Fall of Napoleon, in 1815, to the Accession of Louis Napoleon, in 1852. 8 vols., 8vo, Cloth, $16 00.

BALDWIN'S PRE-HISTORIC NATIONS. Pre-Historic Nations; or, Inquiries concerning some of the Great Peoples and Civilizations of Antiquity, and their Probable Relation to a still Older Civilization of the Ethiopians or Cushites of Arabia. By JOHN D. BALDWIN, Member of the American Oriental Society. 12mo, Cloth, $1 75.

BARTH'S NORTH AND CENTRAL AFRICA. Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa: being a Journal of an Expedition undertaken under the Auspices of H. B. M.'s Government, in the Years 1849–1855. By HENRY BARTH, Ph.D., D.C.L. Illustrated. 3 vols., 8vo, Cloth, $12 00.

HENRY WARD BEECHER'S SERMONS. Sermons by HENRY WARD BEECHER, Plymouth Church, Brooklyn. Selected from Published and Unpublished Discourses, and Revised by their Author. With Steel Portrait. Complete in 2 vols., 8vo, Cloth, $5 00.

LYMAN BEECHER'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY, &c. Autobiography, Correspondence, &c., of Lyman Beecher, D.D. Edited by his Son, CHARLES BEECHER. With Three Steel Portraits, and Engravings on Wood. In 2 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $5 00.

BOSWELL'S JOHNSON. The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D. Including a Journey to the Hebrides. By JAMES BOSWELL, Esq. A New Edition, with numerous Additions and Notes. By JOHN WILSON CROKER, LL.D., F.R.S. Portrait of Boswell. 2 vols., 8vo, Cloth, $4 00.

DRAPER'S CIVIL WAR. History of the American Civil War. By JOHN W. DRAPER, M.D., LL.D., Professor of Chemistry and Physiology in the University of New York. In Three Vols. 8vo, Cloth, $3 50 per vol.

DRAPER'S INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPE. A History of the Intellectual Development of Europe. By JOHN W. DRAPER, M.D., LL.D., Professor of Chemistry and Physiology in the University of New York. 8vo, Cloth, $5 00.

DRAPER'S AMERICAN CIVIL POLICY. Thoughts on the Future Civil Policy of America. By JOHN W. DRAPER, M.D., LL.D., Professor of Chemistry and Physiology in the University of New York. Crown 8vo, Cloth, $2 50.

DU CHAILLU'S AFRICA. Explorations and Adventures in Equatorial Africa: with Accounts of the Manners and Customs of the People, and of the Chase of the Gorilla, the Crocodile, Leopard, Elephant, Hippopotamus, and other Animals. By PAUL B. DU CHAILLU. Numerous Illustrations. 8vo, Cloth, $5 00.

BELLOWS'S OLD WORLD. The Old World in its New Face: Impressions of Europe in 1867–1868. By HENRY W. BELLOWS. 2 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $3 50.

BRODHEAD'S HISTORY OF NEW YORK. History of the State of New York. By JOHN ROMEYN BRODHEAD. 1609–1691. 2 vols. 8vo, Cloth, $3 00 per vol.

BROUGHAM'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY. Life and Times of HENRY, LORD BROUGHAM. Written by Himself. In Three Volumes. 12mo, Cloth, $2 00 per vol.

BULWER'S PROSE WORKS. Miscellaneous Prose Works of Edward Bulwer, Lord Lytton. 2 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $3 50.

BULWER'S HORACE. The Odes and Epodes of Horace. A Metrical Translation into English. With Introduction and Commentaries. By LORD LYTTON. With Latin Text from the Editions of Orelli, Macleane, and Yonge. 12mo, Cloth, $1 75.

BULWER'S KING ARTHUR. A Poem. By EARL LYTTON. New Edition. 12mo, Cloth, $1 75.

BURNS'S LIFE AND WORKS. The Life and Works of Robert Burns. Edited by ROBERT CHAMBERS. 4 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $6 00.

REINDEER, DOGS, AND SNOW-SHOES. A Journal of Siberian Travel and Explorations made in the Years 1865–'67. By RICHARD J. BUSH, late of the Russo-American Telegraph Expedition. Illustrated. Crown 8vo, Cloth, $3 00.

CARLYLE'S FREDERICK THE GREAT. History of Friedrich II., called Frederick the Great. By THOMAS CARLYLE. Portraits, Maps, Plans, &c. 6 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $12 00.

CARLYLE'S FRENCH REVOLUTION. History of the French Revolution. Newly Revised by the Author, with Index, &c. 2 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $3 50.

CARLYLE'S OLIVER CROMWELL. Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell. With Elucidations and Connecting Narrative. 2 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $3 50.

CHALMERS'S POSTHUMOUS WORKS. The Posthumous Works of Dr. Chalmers. Edited by his Son-in-Law, Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, LL.D. Complete in 9 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $13 50.

COLERIDGE'S COMPLETE WORKS. The Complete Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. With an Introductory Essay upon his Philosophical and Theological Opinions. Edited by Professor SHEDD. Complete in Seven Vols. With a fine Portrait. Small 8vo, Cloth, $10 50.

DOOLITTLE'S CHINA. Social Life of the Chinese: with some Account of their Religious, Governmental, Educational, and Business Customs and Opinions. With special but not exclusive Reference to Fuhchau. By Rev. JUSTUS DOOLITTLE, Fourteen Years Member of the Fuhchau Mission of the American Board. Illustrated with more than 150 characteristic Engravings on Wood. 2 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $5 00.

GIBBON'S ROME. History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. By EDWARD GIBBON. With Notes by Rev. H. H. MILMAN and M. GUIZOT. A new cheap Edition. To which is added a complete Index of the whole Work, and a Portrait of the Author. 6 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $9 00.

HAZEN'S SCHOOL AND ARMY IN GERMANY AND FRANCE. The School and the Army in Germany and France, with a Diary of Siege Life at Versailles. By Brevet Major-General W. B. HAZEN, U.S.A., Colonel Sixth Infantry. Crown 8vo, Cloth, $2 50.

HARPER'S NEW CLASSICAL LIBRARY. Literal Translations.

The following Volumes are now ready. Portraits. 12mo, Cloth, $1 50 each.

CÆSAR.—VIRGIL.—SALLUST.—HORACE.—CICERO'S ORATIONS.—CICERO'S OFFICES, &C.—CICERO ON ORATORY AND ORATORS.—TACITUS (2 vols.).—TERENCE.—SOPHOCLES.—JUVENAL.—XENOPHON.—HOMER'S ILIAD.—HOMER'S ODYSSEY.—HERODOTUS.—DEMOSTHENES.—THUCYDIDES.—ÆSCHYLUS.—EURIPIDES (2 vols.).—LIVY (2 vols.).

DAVIS'S CARTHAGE. Carthage and her Remains: being an Account of the Excavations and Researches on the Site of the Phœnician Metropolis in Africa and other adjacent Places. Conducted under the Auspices of Her Majesty's Government. By Dr. DAVIS, F.R.G.S. Profusely Illustrated with Maps, Woodcuts, Chromo-Lithographs, &c. 8vo, Cloth, $4 00.

EDGEWORTH'S (MISS) NOVELS. With Engravings. 10 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $15 00.

GROTE'S HISTORY OF GREECE. 12 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $18 00.

HELPS'S SPANISH CONQUEST. The Spanish Conquest in America, and its Relation to the History of Slavery and to the Government of Colonies. By ARTHUR HELPS. 4 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $6 00.

HALE'S (MRS.) WOMAN'S RECORD. Woman's Record; or, Biographical Sketches of all Distinguished Women, from the Creation to the Present Time. Arranged in Four Eras, with Selections from Female Writers of each Era. By Mrs. SARAH JOSEPHA HALE. Illustrated with more than 200 Portraits. 8vo, Cloth, $5 00.

HALL'S ARCTIC RESEARCHES. Arctic Researches and Life among the Esquimaux: being the Narrative of an Expedition in Search of Sir John Franklin, in the Years 1860, 1861, and 1862. By CHARLES FRANCIS HALL. With Maps and 100 Illustrations. The Illustrations are from Original Drawings by Charles Parsons, Henry L. Stephens, Solomon Eytinge, W. S. L. Jewett, and Granville Perkins, after Sketches by Captain Hall. 8vo, Cloth, $5 00.

HALLAM'S CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Accession of Henry VII. to the Death of George II. 8vo, Cloth, $2 00.

HALLAM'S LITERATURE. Introduction to the Literature of Europe during the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries. By HENRY HALLAM. 2 vols., 8vo, Cloth, $4 00.

HALLAM'S MIDDLE AGES. State of Europe during the Middle Ages. By HENRY HALLAM. 8vo, Cloth, $2 00.

HILDRETH'S HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES. FIRST SERIES: From the First Settlement of the Country to the Adoption of the Federal Constitution. SECOND SERIES: From the Adoption of the Federal Constitution to the End of the Sixteenth Congress. 6 vols., 8vo, Cloth, $18 00.

HUME'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND. History of England, from the Invasion of Julius Cæsar to the Abdication of James II., 1688. By DAVID HUME. A new Edition, with the Author's last Corrections and Improvements. To which is Prefixed a short Account of his Life, written by Himself. With a Portrait of the Author. 6 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $9 00.

JAY'S WORKS. Complete Works of Rev. William Jay: comprising his Sermons, Family Discourses, Morning and Evening Exercises for every Day in the Year, Family Prayers, &c. Author's enlarged Edition, revised. 3 vols., 8vo, Cloth, $6 00.

JEFFERSON'S DOMESTIC LIFE. The Domestic Life of Thomas Jefferson: compiled from Family Letters and Reminiscences by his Great-Granddaughter, SARAH N. RANDOLPH. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, Illuminated Cloth, Beveled Edges, $2 50.

JOHNSON'S COMPLETE WORKS. The Works of Samuel Johnson, LL.D. With an Essay on his Life and Genius, by ARTHUR MURPHY, Esq. Portrait of Johnson. 2 vols., 8vo, Cloth, $4 00.

KINGLAKE'S CRIMEAN WAR. The Invasion of the Crimea, and an Account of its Progress down to the Death of Lord Raglan. By ALEXANDER WILLIAM KINGLAKE. With Maps and Plans. Two Vols. ready. 12mo, Cloth, $2 00 per vol.

KINGSLEY'S WEST INDIES. At Last: A Christmas in the West Indies. By CHARLES KINGSLEY. Illustrated. 12mo, Cloth, $1 50.

KRUMMACHER'S DAVID, KING OF ISRAEL. David, the King of Israel: a Portrait drawn from Bible History and the Book of Psalms. By FREDERICK WILLIAM KRUMMACHER, D.D., Author of "Elijah the Tishbite," &c. Translated under the express Sanction of the Author by the Rev. M. G. EASTON, M.A. With a Letter from Dr. Krummacher to his American Readers, and a Portrait. 12mo, Cloth, $1 75.

LAMB'S COMPLETE WORKS. The Works of Charles Lamb. Comprising his Letters, Poems, Essays of Elia, Essays upon Shakspeare, Hogarth, &c., and a Sketch of his Life, with the Final Memorials, by T. NOON TALFOURD. Portrait. 2 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $3 00.

LIVINGSTONE'S SOUTH AFRICA. Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa; including a Sketch of Sixteen Years' Residence in the Interior of Africa, and a Journey from the Cape of Good Hope to Loando on the West Coast; thence across the Continent, down the River Zambesi, to the Eastern Ocean. By DAVID LIVINGSTONE, LL.D., D.C.L. With Portrait, Maps by Arrowsmith, and numerous Illustrations. 8vo, Cloth, $4 50.

LIVINGSTONES' ZAMBESI. Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambesi and its Tributaries, and of the Discovery of the Lakes Shirwa and Nyassa. 1858–1864. By DAVID and CHARLES LIVINGSTONE. With Map and Illustrations. 8vo, Cloth, $5 00.

M'CLINTOCK & STRONG'S CYCLOPÆDIA. Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. Prepared by the Rev. JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D.D., and JAMES STRONG, S.T.D. 4 *vols. now ready.* Royal 8vo. Price per vol., Cloth, $5 00; Sheep, $6 00; Half Morocco, $8 00.

MARCY'S ARMY LIFE ON THE BORDER. Thirty Years of Army Life on the Border. Comprising Descriptions of the Indian Nomads of the Plains; Explorations of New Territory; a Trip across the Rocky Mountains in the Winter; Descriptions of the Habits of Different Animals found in the West, and the Methods of Hunting them; with Incidents in the Life of Different Frontier Men, &c., &c. By Brevet Brigadier-General R. B. MARCY, U.S.A., Author of "The Prairie Traveller." With numerous Illustrations. 8vo, Cloth, Beveled Edges, $3 00.

MACAULAY'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND. The History of England from the Accession of James II. By THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULAY. With an Original Portrait of the Author. 5 vols., 8vo, Cloth, $10 00; 12mo, Cloth, $7 50.

MOSHEIM'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, Ancient and Modern; in which the Rise, Progress, and Variation of Church Power are considered in their Connection with the State of Learning and Philosophy, and the Political History of Europe during that Period. Translated, with Notes, &c., by A. MACLAINE, D.D. A new Edition, continued to 1826, by C. COOTE, LL.D. 2 vols., 8vo, Cloth, $4 00.

NEVIUS'S CHINA. China and the Chinese: a General Description of the Country and its Inhabitants; its Civilization and Form of Government; its Religious and Social Institutions; its Intercourse with other Nations; and its Present Condition and Prospects. By the Rev. JOHN L. NEVIUS, Ten Years a Missionary in China. With a Map and Illustrations. 12mo, Cloth, $1 75.

THE DESERT OF THE EXODUS. Journeys on Foot in the Wilderness of the Forty Years' Wanderings; undertaken in connection with the Ordnance Survey of Sinai and the Palestine Exploration Fund. By E. H. PALMER, M.A., Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic, and Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. With Maps and numerous Illustrations from Photographs and Drawings taken on the spot by the Sinai Survey Expedition and C. F. Tyrwhitt Drake. Crown 8vo, Cloth, $3 00.

OLIPHANT'S CHINA AND JAPAN. Narrative of the Earl of Elgin's Mission to China and Japan, in the Years 1857, '58, '59. By LAURENCE OLIPHANT, Private Secretary to Lord Elgin. Illustrations. 8vo, Cloth, $3 50.

OLIPHANT'S (MRS.) LIFE OF EDWARD IRVING. The Life of Edward Irving, Minister of the National Scotch Church, London. Illustrated by his Journals and Correspondence. By Mrs. OLIPHANT. Portrait. 8vo, Cloth, $3 50.

RAWLINSON'S MANUAL OF ANCIENT HISTORY. A Manual of Ancient History, from the Earliest Times to the Fall of the Western Empire. Comprising the History of Chaldæa, Assyria, Media, Babylonia, Lydia, Phœnicia, Syria, Judæa, Egypt, Carthage, Persia, Greece, Macedonia, Parthia, and Rome. By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford. 12mo, Cloth, $2 50.

RECLUS'S THE EARTH. The Earth: a Descriptive History of the Phenomena and Life of the Globe. By ELISÉE RECLUS. Translated by the late B. B. Woodward, and Edited by Henry Woodward. With 234 Maps and Illustrations, and 23 Page Maps printed in Colors. 8vo, Cloth, $5 00.

POETS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. The Poets of the Nineteenth Century. Selected and Edited by the Rev. ROBERT ARIS WILLMOTT. With English and American Additions, arranged by EVERT A. DUYCKINCK, Editor of "Cyclopædia of American Literature." Comprising Selections from the Greatest Authors of the Age. Superbly Illustrated with 141 Engravings from Designs by the most Eminent Artists. In elegant small 4to form, printed on Superfine Tinted Paper, richly bound in extra Cloth, Beveled, Gilt Edges, $5 00; Half Calf, $5 50; Full Turkey Morocco, $9 00.

SHAKSPEARE. The Dramatic Works of William Shakspeare, with the Corrections and Illustrations of Dr. JOHNSON, G. STEEVENS, and others. Revised by ISAAC REED. Engravings. 6 vols., Royal 12mo, Cloth, $9 00.

SMILES'S LIFE OF THE STEPHENSONS. The Life of George Stephenson, and of his Son, Robert Stephenson; comprising, also, a History of the Invention and Introduction of the Railway Locomotive. By SAMUEL SMILES, Author of "Self-Help," &c. With Steel Portraits and numerous Illustrations. 8vo, Cloth, $3 00.

SMILES'S HISTORY OF THE HUGUENOTS. The Huguenots: their Settlements, Churches, and Industries in England and Ireland. By SAMUEL SMILES. With an Appendix relating to the Huguenots in America. Crown 8vo, Cloth, $1 75.

SPEKE'S AFRICA. Journal of the Discovery of the Source of the Nile. By Captain JOHN HANNING SPEKE, Captain H. M. Indian Army, Fellow and Gold Medalist of the Royal Geographical Society, Hon. Corresponding Member and Gold Medalist of the French Geographical Society, &c. With Maps and Portraits and numerous Illustrations, chiefly from Drawings by Captain GRANT. 8vo, Cloth, uniform with Livingstone, Barth, Burton, &c., $4 00.

STRICKLAND'S (Miss) QUEENS OF SCOTLAND. Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses connected with the Regal Succession of Great Britain. By AGNES STRICKLAND. 8 vols., 12mo, Cloth, $12 00.

THE STUDENT'S SERIES.

France. Engravings. 12mo, Cloth, $2 00.
Gibbon. Engravings. 12mo, Cloth, $2 00.
Greece. Engravings. 12mo, Cloth, $2 00.
Hume. Engravings. 12mo, Cloth, $2 00.
Rome. By Liddell. Engravings. 12mo, Cloth, $2 00.
Old Testament History. Engravings. 12mo, Cloth, $2 00.
New Testament History. Engravings. 12mo, Cloth, $2 00.
Strickland's Queens of England. Abridged. Engravings. 12mo, Cloth, $2 00.
Ancient History of the East. 12mo, Cloth, $2 00.
Hallam's Middle Ages. 12mo, Cloth, $2 00.
Lyell's Elements of Geology. 12mo, Cloth, $2 00.

TENNYSON'S COMPLETE POEMS. The Complete Poems of Alfred Tennyson, Poet Laureate. With numerous Illustrations by Eminent Artists, and Three Characteristic Portraits. 8vo, Paper, 75 cents; Cloth, $1 25.

THOMSON'S LAND AND THE BOOK. The Land and the Book; or, Biblical Illustrations drawn from the Manners and Customs, the Scenes and the Scenery of the Holy Land. By W. M. THOMSON, D.D., Twenty-five Years a Missionary of the A.B.C.F.M. in Syria and Palestine. With two elaborate Maps of Palestine, an accurate Plan of Jerusalem, and several hundred Engravings, representing the Scenery, Topography, and Productions of the Holy Land, and the Costumes, Manners, and Habits of the People. 2 large 12mo vols., Cloth, $5 00.

TYERMAN'S WESLEY. The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley, M.A., Founder of the Methodists. By the Rev. LUKE TYERMAN, Author of "The Life of Rev. Samuel Wesley." Portraits. 3 vols., Crown 8vo, Cloth, $7 50.

VÁMBÉRY'S CENTRAL ASIA. Travels in Central Asia. Being the Account of a Journey from Teheran across the Turkoman Desert, on the Eastern Shore of the Caspian, to Khiva, Bokhara, and Samarcand, performed in the Year 1863. By ARMINIUS VÁMBÉRY, Member of the Hungarian Academy of Pesth, by whom he was sent on this Scientific Mission. With Map and Woodcuts. 8vo, Cloth, $4 50.

WOOD'S HOMES WITHOUT HANDS. Homes Without Hands: being a Description of the Habitations of Animals, classed according to their Principle of Construction. By J. G. WOOD, M.A., F.L.S. With about 140 Illustrations. 8vo, Cloth, Beveled Edges, $4 50.

776

HIEBERT LIBRARY
3 6877 00163 5936

BS
2088
.L5

DATE DUE

APR 24 '01
NOV 14 '02
JAN 09 2003

DEMCO 38-297